

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

VOL. XXII, 2.

WHOLE No. 86.

I.—A FURTHER COLLECTION OF LATIN PROVERBS.

II.

DAEDALUS, p. 105. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 7, 12 (M. 199, 662 C) Daedalo doctior; for Greek parallels see Wiesenthal, p. 51.

DARE 2, p. 106. Acta inst. Arch. Rom. 1861, p. 37 (Carm. Epigr. 190, 5 B.) dederunt, acceperunt, dum essent, fruniti sunt; Diogen. 2, 77* ἅμα δίδου καὶ λαμβάνε: ὅταν πρὸς ἄπιστον συναλλάσσωμεν Eustath. opusc. 152, 54; 315, 10 δός τι καὶ λαβέ τι, cited by Varro sat. 498 (B.); compare the English 'give and take.'

DEBERE, Szel., p. 32. Braulio ep. 5 (M. 80, 653 A) redde, redde, quos debes; Maxim. eleg. 5, 52 debita redde mihi; Steph. Torn. ep. 2, 51, 68 (M. 211, 348) redde quod debes.

DECANTARE, p. 106. Compare Plaut. Pseud. 1082 verba quae in comoediis | solent lenoni dici, quae pueri sciunt; Plat. symp. 204 B.

DECET 1, p. 106. Tibull. 1, 4, 77 gloria cuique suast.

DEDUCTIO. Sen. ben. 2, 4, 3 sine ulla, quod aiunt, deductione; ep. 58, 31 sine ulla deductione; cf. CIL. 2, 1474.

DELIRARE. Lactant. instit. 3, 17, 29 de homine, quo sano ac vigente nullus aeger ineptius deliravit; de ira 10, 3 qui profecto solus omnium caecus et excors fuit qui ea loqueretur quae nec aeger quisquam delirare nec dormiens posset somniare; see Brandt-Laubmann's index s. v. *proverbia*; cf. *somnium*, p. 328, Otto.

DENS 1, p. 107. Sidon. Apoll. c. 4, 15 non ego mordaci fodiam modo dente Maronem; compare Sen. d. 7, 20, 6 citius multo frangetis dentes quam imprimetis; Braulio ep. 11 (M. 80, 657 C)

posse genuinum laesus infigere; Petr. Dam. ep. 5, 1, 142 (M. 144, 339) Gregorium mordeant et in eum dentes amarissimi livoris infligant; cf. Hildebert. de quat. vir. (M. 171, 1060 D) dente sales careant; Petr. Cell. ep. 69 (M. 202, 515 A) sales tui sine dente sunt; Mart. Dum. form. hon. vit. 22, 8; note for a similar use of *dens* Ruric. ep. 2, 40, p. 425, 5 (Eng.) qualiter me et quam assiduae dilectionis dente ruminetis.

DEUCALION. Lucan 1, 653 Deucalioneos fudisset Aquarius imbres.

DEUS 1, p. 108. Baeda ep. 2 (M. 94, 662 D) sed quia huiusmodi maxima et plurima sunt loca quae, ut volgo dici solet, neque Deo neque hominibus utilia sunt.

DEUS 5, p. 109. Plaut. Pers. 100 O mi Iuppiter | terrestris; Poen. 1219 si sim Iuppiter, | iam hercle ego illam uxorem ducam; CIL. IV 1928 (Carm. Epigr. 937, 2 B.) peream, sine te si deus esse velim; compare Tibull. 2, 3, 32 fabula sit mavolt quam sine amore deus; Iul. Val. 2, 33, p. 104, 24 (K.) nec si quid blandius fortuna promiserit, idcirco te coeli compotem arbitrare; Optat. Mil. 3, 3, p. 77, 13 (Z.) in quo si unus quisque hominum erravit, ipse prohibere debuerat, cum non prohibuit, deus sibi visus est; p. 78, 16 quod extulit cor suum et deus sibi fuisse videbatur; Pythag. spr. 4¹ ἄξιός ἀνθρώπος θεῶν θεὸς ἂν εἴη ἐν ἀνθρώποις; compare Cic. de orat. 3, 14, 53 quem deum, ut ita dicam, inter homines putant.

DEUS 9, p. 110. Compare Petron. 134 malo astro natus est; Stat. silv. 3, 4, 63 o sidere dextro | edite.

DEUS 11, p. 111. Acro ad Hor. c. 3, 2, 31 tamquam raro poena deserat scelestum et quamvis tarde, tamen puniat; Eurip. frag. 979, 3 (N.) ἡ Δίκη . . . σίγα καὶ βραδεί ποδι | στείχουσα μάρψει τοὺς κακοὺς, ὄταν τύχη; see Koch, II, p. 5.

DEXTERA 1, p. 111. Steph. Torn. ep. 2, 101, 145 (M. 211, 392) in consiliis nostris oculus vigilans, in negotiis dextera manus.

DEXTERA 2. Incert. auct. epigr. 132 (PLM. 4, p. 120, 9 Baehr.) nullus ubique potest felici ludere dextra, has a proverbial sound.

DEXTERA 3 (compare Otto, *dextera* 1). Paulin. Nol. ep. 1, 5, p. 4, 20 (H.) sit licet frater et amicus iunctior tibi dextera tua.

DICERE 2, p. 112. Plaut. Truc. 644 verbum sat est; Braulio ep. 21 (M. 80, 670 A) sapienti enim viro pauca dicta sufficiunt; Augustin. ep. 180, 2 satis existimo sapienti esse quod dixi; Fulbert. Carm. ep. 22 (M. 141, 210 B) sapienti pauca; Anselm. Cant.

¹ Schenkl, Wien. Stud. 8, 264.

ep. 2, 13 (M. 158, 1163 C) quia sapientiae vestrae pauca verba sufficere non ignoramus; Wilhelm apud Thom. Cant. ep. 357 (M. 190, 690 C) sapienti sat dictum est; ep. 173 (646 D) satis, credo, dictum est sapienti; Foliot ep. 40 (M. 190, 775 A) quia sapiens docetur paucis; Petr. Cell. ep. 1, 22 (M. 202, 425 B) satis dictum est sapienti.

DICERE 5, p. 112. Ps.-Cypr. c. 6, 56, p. 310, 56 (H., vol. III) dicto citius; Orient. com. 1, 265; Severus rhet. bucol. 49 (M. 19, 799 A); Aldh. de sept. aenig. 14 D (M. 89, 198); Alcuin de pontif. 1109 (M. 101, 834 D); Hrosuitha Mon. com. Callimach. (M. 137, 1008 B); Dud. Dec. de gest. Norm. duc. epist. (M. 141, 610 B); Gualb. ep. 310 (M. 146, 935 C) velocius dictis; compare Stat. Theb. 7, 27 dicto ocus; 4, 679 dicto prius¹; Hier. ep. 29, 1 celerius dicto; Eustath. opusc. 330, 60 *θάρρον ἢ λόγος*.² Note also the expression used more than once by Nicol. Clar. ep. 33 (M. 196, 1623 D) ad nutum nutu citius.

DICERE 6, p. 112. Plaut. Pseud. 629 dum tu sternuas, | res erit soluta, with which compare Theokr. 29, 27 *χῶτι γηραλέοι πέλομεν πρὶν ἀποπύσαι*; Paulin. Nol. ep. 31, 11, p. 273, 11 (H.) nec mora: verbum factum; Ps.-Cypr. c. 2, 61, p. 292, 4 (H., vol. III) dicta et facta simul; Petr. Dam. ep. 6, 19, 207 (M. 144, 402) dictum factumque est; with Horace's 'dum loquimur' (c. 1, 11, 7) compare Ovid am. 1, 11, 15 dum loquor, hora fugit; ex Pont. 4, 3, 58 dum loqueris, fieri tristia posse puta; Hildebert. carm. misc. 1345 (M. 171, 1419 B) et modo, dum loqueris, desinit esse tuum; Eustath. Il. 724, 48 *ἄμ' ἔπος, ἄμ' ἔργον*³; see further Preuss, p. 37.

DICERE 6, n., p. 112. Add further Sen. d. 2, 10, 2; 5, 36, 3; 6, 5, 2; 7, 20, 5; 11, 18, 8; clem. 1, 3, 2; 1, 8, 1; ep. 34, 4; 95, 45; Curt. 7, 1, 36; Tac. ann. 3, 65; Sidon. Apoll. ep. 7, 2, 4; 9, 9, 16; Symmach. ep. 1, 78, 1.

DIES 1, p. 112. Hor. c. 2, 5, 13 currit enim ferox | aetas; 3, 29, 47 infectumque reddet | quod fugiens semel hora vexit; Octav. Aug. (PLM. 4, p. 110, epigr. 122, 5 Baehr.) fugit hora, iocemur; CIL. 5, 6134 (Carm. Epigr. 1309, 1 B.) siste gradum, fugiat quamvis brevis hora, viator; Licent. ad Augustin. ep. 26, 3 (M. 33, 104) tempus enim, nisi me mortalia fallunt, labitur; Columban. c. 1, 24 (M. 80, 285) tempus et hora volat; Alcuin ep. 43, 52 (M. 100, 208 A) tempus huius vitae velociter currit, fugit et non revertitur.

DIES 2, p. 113. Alcuin ep. 115 (M. 100, 345 B) nec semper

¹ Woelfflin, ALL. 6, 463.

² Kurtz, p. 313.

³ Kurtz, p. 309.

nox, nec semper dies, . . . hodie tempestas imminet, sed cras serenitas arridet; ep. 111 (336 C) nox et dies vices suas peragunt . . . tempestas serenitatis tranquillitate mitigatur; Menand. monost. 751 (IV, p. 361, M.) χειμῶν μεταβάλλει ῥᾱδίως εἰς εὐδίαν; Pind. Isth. 6 (7), 38 εὐδίαν ὅπασσεν ἐκ χειμῶνος; Pyth. 5, 10; Herond. 1, 44 (see Crusius, p. 14); compare Alan. Insul. lib. parab. (M. 210, 581 C) clarior est solito, post nubila plurima Phoebus.

DIES 6, p. 113. Sen. d. 6, 8, 1 dolorem dies longa consumit; Ovid a. a. 2, 647 multa vetustas | lenit; ex Pont. 4, 11, 14 finitumque tuum, si non ratione, dolorem | ipsa iam pridem suspicor esse mora, with which compare incert. auct. Agam. 131 quod ratio non quit, saepe sanavit mora; Hier. ep. 97, 2 rogo, quis est iste dolor qui nec tempore, nec ratione curatur; Alcuin ep. 106 (M. 100, 321) saepe dolor tempore sanabitur, qui ratione non poterit; Sen. d. 6, 1, 6 illud ipsum naturale remedium temporis; Symmach. ep. 1, 100, 1 ne fortunae vulnera, quae cicatricem processu temporis ducunt; Publil. Syr. 422 nil non aut lenit aut domat diuturnitas; Mantiss. 1, 100 λύπης δὲ πάσης γίνετ' ἰατρὸς χρόνος; see Leutsch's note.

DIES 7, p. 114. Ennod., p. 361, 16 (H.) diem putabant perisse, qui illos sine facinore . . . fugisset; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 3, 14 (M. 199, 510 D) cites the anecdote from Suetonius.

DIES 8, p. 114. Sen. rem. fort. 10, 1 pecora in diem vivunt; CIL. 1, 1010 (Carm. Epigr. 185 B.) vive in dies et horas, nam proprium est nihil.

[DIES 11. Plaut. Aulul. 380 festo die si quid prodegeris, profesto egere liceat, nisi peperceris; Afran. 262 (R.) aequae profesto <ac festo> concelebras focum. This thought may have been the basis of some homely proverb.]

DIES 12. Venant. Fort. 4, 26, 131 quantum nocte dies distat, sol lampade lunae; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 3, 12 (M. 199, 500 D) quantum lux distat a tenebris.

DIES 13. The expression, dies me deficiet, became formulaic and quasi-proverbial. Gualbert. (M. 146, 895) non dies, ut aiunt, sed annus me deficeret; Ovid m. 15, 418 desinet ante dies; Verg. Aen. 1, 373; Cic. nat. deor. 3, 32, 81; Tusc. 5, 35, 102; Cael. 29; Sen. ben. 3, 12, 4; Apul. mag. 54, p. 516 (with Hildebrand's note); Hier. ep. 69, 7; compare Plaut. Trin. 885 si ante lucem ire occipias a meo primo nomine, | concubium sit noctis prius quam ad postremum veneris.

DIES 14. Sen. ep. 12, 8 itaque sic ordinandus est dies omnis, tamquam cogat agmen et consummet atque expleat vitam; Hor. ep.

1, 4, 13 omnem crede diem tibi diluxisse supremum. This thought was not infrequently quoted in mediaeval Latin. Othlo lib. prov. 14 (see also d. 50, col. 133) in Migne 146, 323 A says: omnis dies velut ultimus tractandus est; Ps.-Baeda lib. prov. (M. 90, 1104); Alcuin ep. 182, 200 (M. 100, 453 B) omnis dies quasi ultimus habendus; Herveus ad Thom. Cant. ep. 365 (M. 190, 696 B) cites Hor. ep. 1, 4, 13.

DIGITUS 3, p. 115. Plaut. Poen. 1308 quid tibi hanc digito tactiost; Rud. 720 tange utramvis digitulo minumo modo; Phaedr. append. 15, 4 nec inveniret digito qui se tangeret; Bochar. de rep. laps. 17 (M. 20, 1054) et ipse digito meo nolim contingere ea; Petr. Cell. ep. 118 (M. 202, 568 C) digito autem suo nec quaeque modica tangentes; see S. Matth. 23, 4.

DIGITUS 4, p. 115. Ps.-Cypr. de rebapt. 19, p. 92, 13 (H.) ne qui putet nos unico articulo praesentem altercationem suscitare; Alan. Insul. lib. parab. 3 (M. 210, 587 A) non bene firmus erat, digito qui solvitur uno | nodus.

DIGITUS 5, p. 115. Lactant. instit. 1, 20, 26 colunt enim ture ac summis digitis, contrasted with 'sensibus intimis'; Fronto ad Ver. 2, 1, p. 128, 18 (Nab.) loricas partim eorum digitis primoribus scinderet; Hier. ep. 14, 5 non est tantum in eo servitus idoli si quis duobus digitulis thura in bustum arae iaciat; Anthol. Pal. 15, 13, 2 εἰ δέ γε Μούσης | δακτύλῳ ἀκροτάτῳ ἀπεγέυσας.

DIGITUS 8, p. 116. Ovid a. a. 2, 629 ne desint, quas tu digitis ostendere possis; Apul. met. 3, 12 manibus denotatus; 11, 16 digitis hominum nutibusque notabilis; Hier. ep. 27, 2 cunctorum digitis notor; Ennod. vit. S. Epiph., p. 345, 24 (H.) fama quae absentem illum notum fecerat, digito coepit ostendere; incert. auct. dial. de caus. corr. eloq. 7 quos . . . hic populus transeuntes nomine vocat et digito demonstrat; Mart. Dum. de form. hon. vit. 6, 3 monstraberis digito; Hildebert. de quat. vir. (M. 171, 1063 C) protenso digito plenus monstraberis astu; Abaelard. ep. 1, 8 (M. 178, 135 B) omnium digitis demonstrandus; Steph. Torn. suppl. ep. 11 (M. 211, 550) ostendimur digito; serm. (573) sed quem Ioannes digito demonstrat; Lucian, Anach. 36, 917; for further Greek parallels see Koch, II, p. 25.

DIGITUS 12, p. 116. Compare Plutarch. Iul. Caes. 4 τὴν κόμην . . . ἴδω κακῆινον ἐνὶ δακτύλῳ κνώμενον; see further T. Eichtmeyer, p. 38.¹

¹ Proben aus einer abhandlung über namen und symbolische bedeutung der finger bei Griech. und Röm., Halle, 1835.

DIGITUS 14, p. 117. Sen. suas. 2, 17 insistens summis digitis . . . exclamat, gaudeo, gaudeo.

DIGNUS, p. 117. Verg. Aen. 9, 595 digna atque indigna relatu; append. prov. 1, 100 δοῦλε, δεσποτῶν ἄκουε καὶ δίκαια κᾷδικα, or in the other form κρείσσόνων γὰρ καὶ δίκαια κᾷδικ' ἔστ' ἀκούειν, with which compare Plaut. Capt. 199 indigna digna habenda sunt erus quae fecit; see also Preuss, p. 43.

DIGNUS 2, Sonny, ALL. 8, 486. Add Crusius, Herond., p. 148.

DIMIDIUM, p. 117. Plaut. Mil. 916 bene lineatam si semel carinam conlocavit, | facile esse navem facere; dig. 1, 2, 1 et certe cuiusque rei potissima pars principium est; Abbo Floriac. ep. 9 (M. 139, 432 B), Petr. Bles. ep. 11 (M. 207, 33 C), and Alan. de Insul. lib. parab. (M. 210, 590 C) cite Hor. ep. 1, 2, 20; compare also Ovid rem. am. 120 difficiles aditus impetus omnis habet; Sen. rem. fort. 10, 9 difficiles habet aditus primos; cetera prona, iucunda, facilia (compare Hor. sat. 1, 9, 55); Plat. resp. 377 A; see Grünwald, p. 9.

DIMIDIUS, p. 118. Ovid fast. 5, 718 dimidium toto munere maius erit.

DISCERE 2, p. 118. Petr. Dam. ep. 2, 1, 51 (M. 144, 254) saepe namque melius ipsi discimus, dum docemus.

DISCERE 3, p. 118. Sen. d. 10, 7, 4 vivere tota vita discendum est; Augustin. ep. 166, 1 (M. 33, 720) sed ad discendum quod opus est nulla mihi aetas sera videri potest; Alcuin ep. 84 (M. 100, 277 C) nulla aetas, ut ait comicus, sera debet esse ad sapientiam discendam; Zenob. 3, 4 γηράσκω δ' αἰεὶ πολλὰ διδασκόμενος (Solon).

DISCERE 5. Cassiod. var. 7, 23, 1 in parvis enim discitur cui potiora praestentur; 7, 29, 2 ut in parvis agnoscere possimus cui maiora credere debeamus; cf. Ovid a. a. 3, 525 quis vetat a magnis ad res exempla minores | sumere?

DOCERE 1, p. 119. Phaedr. 5, 9, 5 qui doctiorem emendat, sibi dici putet; Sen. ep. 94, 11 quid ista praecepta proficiunt, quae eruditum docent? Novatian. de cib. lud. (ALL. 11, p. 226, 19) instruum iam eruditos; Petr. Dam. ep. 2, 11 (M. 144, 276) et hoc sit meum pungere, doctiorem velle docere; see Koch, II, p. 25.

DOMESTICUS, Sonny, ALL. 8, 487. Paulin. Nol. ep. 47, 9, p. 397, 26 (H.) domesticis utamur exemplis; Ioh. Sar. metal. 3, 10 (M. 199, 911 D) domestica namque exempla magis movent.

DOMINUS 1, p. 119. Compare Diogen. 5, 93 αἱ κύνες τὴν δέσποιναν μιμούμεναι; Plat. resp. 563 C αἱ κύνες . . . οἵτινες αἱ δέσποιναι.

DOMINUS 2. Sen. ep. 5, 6 qui domum intraverit, nos potius

miretur quam suppellectilem nostram; Ps.-Sen. de mor. 121 (Haase, III 466) sic habita ut potius laudetur dominus quam domus; sent. Varr. 53 (Riese) illum elige eruditorem, quem magis mireris in suis quam in alienis; Martin. Dum. form. hon. vit. 4, 5, p. 7, 1 (Weid.) si continentiae studes, habita non amoene sed salubriter nec dominum notum velis a domo sed domum a domino¹; Alan. de Insul. lib. parab. (M. 210, 583 B) non domus, at dominus laudetur, si bonus is sit.

DOMUS 3, p. 120. Sen. ep. 72, 4 domestica illi felicitas . . . ibi nascitur; Iuven. 11, 118 domi natus . . . mensas; see Heraeus Petron., p. 11, N. 1; note also Petron. 44 domi gaudere; corp. gloss. 4, 86, 49 hilarens, apud se gaudens; Heraeus, p. 31.

DOMUS 6. Apul. met. 7, 16 scilicet ut, quod aiunt, domi forisque fortibus factis adoriae plenae gloriarer; see Hildebrand's note.

DOMUS 7. Iul. Cap., Anton. Pius 11, 8 cum in domum alienam veneris, et mutus et surdus esto, sounds proverbial.

DONUM, p. 120. Verg. Aen. 2, 49 is cited by Thom. Cant. ep. 24 (M. 190, 473 D), with the remark, 'sed proverbium est'; also by Ivo Carnot. ep. 128 (M. 162, 139 A); for Greek parallels compare Eustath. opusc. 317, 86³; Greg. Cypr. Leid. 2, 15 (with Leutsch's note); append. prov. 2, 94; see further Koch, II, p. 12.

DORMIRE 1, p. 121. Apul. met. 3, 22 vigilans somniabar; cf. Plaut. Cist. 291 utrum deliras, quaeso, an astans somnias?

DOS, p. 121. Compare Ovid a. a. 3, 258 est illis sua dos, forma sine arte potens.

DUO 1, p. 122. Rufin. Anth. Pal. 5, 93, 4 *τί μόνος πρὸς δὴ' ἐγὼ δύναμαι*; Eustath. Il. 583, 4³; see further Grünwald, p. 7.

DUO 2, p. 122. Ovid a. a. 3, 358 unus cum gemino calculus hoste perit; compare her. 7, 138 poenaeque conexos auferet una duos; 19 (20), 234 quid dubitas unam ferre duobus opem?

DUO 3, p. 122. Compare Ovid rem. am. 449 qui sibi iam pridem solacia bina paravit, | iam pridem summa victor in arce fuit; ex Pont. 3, 2, 6 tu lacerae remanes ancora sola rati; Sen. epigr. 15, 1 (PLM. 4, p. 60 B.) Crispe, meae vires lapsarumque ancora rerum; Ps.-Publil. Syr. 42 (F.) bonum est duabus fundari navem ancoris.

DUO 3, n., p. 122. Hier. ep. 76, 1 funiculus triplex non facile

¹ Woelfflin, Philol. 9, 683, No. 35.

² Kurtz, p. 312.

³ Kurtz, p. 318.

rumpitur; Rath. Ver. phren. 17 (M. 136, 386 B); Othlo lib. prov. 19 (M. 146, 333 C); Bernard. Clar. (M. 183, 491 D); Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 5, 3 (M. 199, 543 D) funiculus triplex . . . qui facile solvi non potest; Petr. Cell. ep. 1, 31 (M. 202, 439 D) hic triplici filo contorquendus est dilectionis funiculus ne facile rumpatur; ep. 1, 37 (450 A) a laqueo sic contorto triplici funiculo, cave tibi; ep. 2, 148 (592 B). Cf. Eccl. 4, 12.

EDERE, p. 123. Caecil. Balb. 60 edas ut vivas; ut edas, noli vivere; Walter Burley de vit. et mor. phil. et poet. 62 edas, bibas ut bene vivas, non vivas ut tantum edas et bibas¹; Petr. Bles. ep. 85 (M. 207, 261 A) Socrates dicebat, quosdam vivere ut comederent et biberent, se autem comedere et bibere, ut naturae satisfaceret et excursus vitae . . . sustentaret. Compare Iuv. 11, 11 et quibus in solo vivendi causa palato est.

ENDYMION 2, of a beautiful boy. Iuv. 10, 318, sed tuus Endymion . . . fiet adulter; Apul. met. 1, 12, hic est, soror Panthia, carus Endymion.

EQUUS 6, p. 126. Add Flor. 1, 13 (18), 6; see further Preuss, pp. 70 and 91.

ERROR. Othlo lib. prov. 5 (M. 146, 310 A) error erit nimius cum praetores simul errant. The proverb may go back to classic times.

ERROR 2. Veget. 1, 13 deinde in aliis rebus, sicut ait Cato, si quid erratum est, potest postmodum corrigi; proeliorum delicta emendationem non recipiunt. This is the latinized form of the Greek proverb, Apost. 2, 64 ἀμαρτεῖν οὐκ ἐνεστι δις ἐν πολέμῳ.

EURYBATUS, p. 126. For Greek references see Wiesenthal, p. 56.

EXPERTUS 1, p. 127. Avit. Vienn. ep. 3, p. 127, 9 (Chev.) experto credite; Hier. ep. 22, 8 si experto creditur; ep. 52, 8; Ioh. Sar. ep. 228 (M. 199, 256 C); Polycrat. prol. 1 (386 A); Polycrat. 5, 10 (564 A); 8, 23 (814 C); Petr. Cell. ep. 102 (M. 202, 553 D) experto credendum est.

EXPERTUS 2, p. 127. Gualbert. act. 216 (M. 146, 894 D) expertus loquor; Ioh. Sar. ep. 186 (M. 199, 196 D) expertus hoc loquor; ep. 236 (266 C) expertus experto loquor; append. anthol. Pal. 2, 424, 4 ἐγὼ λέγω σοι ταῦθ' ἅπαντα πειράσας.

EXTRA. Sen. d. 2, 1, 1 qui adeo extra omnem teli iactum surrexit, ut supra fortunam emineat; rem. fort. 13, 2 nemo extra

¹ Haupt, Philol. 3, 378.

ictum vulneris positus est; compare Zenob. 3, 89 ζέω βελῶν καθῆσθαι; Eustath. Il. 972, 8¹; Woelfflin,² p. 210.

FABA 3, p. 128. Ioh. Sar. ep. 299 (M. 199, 348 A) et in surdos, ut veteri proverbio dici solet, faba cudatur.

FACERE 2, p. 129. Hor. c. 3, 29, 44 non tamen irritum, | quodcumque retrost, efficiet neque | diffinget infectumque reddet | quod fugiens semel hora vexit; cf. Stat. silv. 4 praef. primum supervacuum est dissuadere rem factam.

FACERE 4. See Preuss, l. c., p. 110.

FACIES 1, p. 130. Hier. ep. 52, 5 illi verbositas, attrita frons; ep. 52, 8; Petr. Bles. ep. 119 (M. 207, 350 D) attritae frontis homo et verecundiae prodigus; Steph. Torn. ep. 2, 147, 221 (M. 211, 435) confidentiam assumpsimus . . . et attrita, ut aiunt, fronte.

FAMA, p. 131. Plaut. frag. inc. fab. 7 (21) (G.-S.) nullam ego rem citiorem apud homines quam famam reor.

FARI 1, p. 132. Liv. 10, 41, 3 fando nefandoque sanguine; see Preuss, p. 43, Jungblut Rhein. Mus. 38, 405.

FARI 2. Plaut. Pers. 174 quom interim tu meum ingenium fans atque infans nondum etiam edidicisti.

FARINA, p. 132. Cassius Parmensis ap. Suet. Aug. 4 materna tibi farinast, 'You are of your mother's kidney,' with a play on the word. The use of *nota* cited in this connection by Otto occurs very often in Seneca; n. q. 2, 21, 4 eiusdem notae ac naturae; ep. 15, 3, pessimae notae mancipia; 24, 23; 42, 1; 52, 3; 110, 1; d. 2, 3, 3, etc; Ovid am. 2, 5, 54 ex hac nota; compare also Sen. ben. 3, 35, 1 quaedam ex nostra, ut ita dicam, moneta proferri; Symmach. ep. 3, 11, 2 spectator tibi veteris monetae solus supersum; append. prov. 2, 47 ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς ψιᾶθου γεγονώς (compare LUTUM 4, Otto); see also Crusius, Herond. p. 30, n. 2.

FAS, p. 132 (see also Weyman ALL. 8, 28). Ovid a. a. 1, 739 an moneam mixtum fas omne nefasque? met. 6, 585 sed fasque nefasque | confusura ruit; met. 9, 551 Sen. d. 4, 9, 2 ad fas nefasque miscendum coorti sunt; Prudent. cath. 3, 134 fasque nefasque simul glomerans.

FAUCES 2, p. 133. Licin. Crass. apud Cic. de orat. 1, 52, 225 eripite nos ex miseriis, eripite ex faucibus eorum quorum crudelitas . . . non potest expleri; Claudian. 26, 449 totaque Tartareis e faucibus oppida traxit; Coripp. Ioh. 3, 281; 6, 12; Boeth. consol. phil. 1, 4, 43 (Peiper) Paulinum consularem virum . . . ab ipsis

¹ Kurtz, p. 312.

² Sitzungsab. Münch. Akad. phil.-hist. class. I, 1888.

hiantium faucibus traxi; Steph. Torn. ep. 2, 165, 255 (M. 211, 454) de mortis faucibus ereptum; compare Sen. d. 6, 22, 6 quod e faucibus avidissimorum luporum educeretur praeda.

FAX. Sulpic. Sev. chron. 2, 46, 9, p. 100, 10 (H.) facem quandam nascenti incendio subdidit; compare OLEUM 2, Otto.

FEMINA. Verg. Aen. 1, 364 dux femina facti, is perhaps an echo of the Greek proverb γυνή στρατηγεί: ἐπὶ τῶν δειλῶν, Diogen. 4, 1.

FERA. Ovid trist. 5, 8, 6 mala . . . | nostra, quibus possint inlacrimare ferae; compare Verg. ecl. 5, 27 and Otto, LAPIS 1.

FERMENTUM 1, p. 133. Compare Plaut. Most. 699 tota turget mihi uxor, scio, domi; Apul. met. 10, 24 . . . quodque frustra paelicatus indignatione bulliret.

FERRE 1, p. 134. Ps.-Sen. ep. ad Paul. 12 feramus aequo animo et utamur foro, quod sors concessit.

FERRE 2, p. 134. Plaut. Rud. 402 ergo animus aequos optimumst aerumnae condimentum; Publil. Syr. 96 cuiusvis dolori remedium est patientia; cf. Propert. 2, 5, 16; Hor. c. 1, 24, 19 is cited by Adalberon ep. 10 (M. 137, 509 A) and by Foliot ep. 79 (M. 190, 798 D).

FERRUM 1, p. 134. Ovid ex Pont. 4, 12, 31 duro tibi pectora ferro | esse clausa . . . putem; her. 20 (21), 229 durius et ferro cum sit tibi pectus; as an epithet used with *cor*, Ovid her. 12, 183 praecordia ferrea; Claudian. 26, 303 nec ferro sic corda rigent; Augustin. ep. 26, 4 (M. 33, 106); Aldh. carm. (M. 89, 282 C); Steph. Torn. ep. 3, 262, 379 (M. 211, 524); with *mens*, Othlo lib. prov. 6 (M. 146, 310 D) ferreas mentes; (311 D) ferrea mens; Hildebert. carm. misc. 1353 (M. 171, 1428 B) mens tua . . . ferrea; Licin. Crass. ap. Suet. Ner. 2 cui os ferreum, cf. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 3, 14 (M. 199, 510 C); Aldh. de sept. aenig. 14 (M. 89, 199 A) durior . . . ferro. The simple adjective, *ferreus*, in this metaphorical sense occurs very frequently in Ovid, met. 13, 515; 14, 721; Cic. Phil. 8, 25 ferrei sumus; 12, 19; Cael. 37; in Pis. 63¹; Propert. 2, 8, 12; Tibull. 1, 2, 67; 2, 3, 2; Mart. 11, 27, 1; Fronto, p. 236, 15 (Nab.); Augustin. ep. 101, 1 (M. 33, 368); Bonif. Mogunt. ep. 63 (M. 89, 766 B) ferrei pectoris; Eustath. Od. 1940, 56 ἀναισχυντος καὶ σιδηροῦς ἄνθρωπος²; see Blaydes on Aristoph. Acharn. 491 and A. Zingerle, p. 43,³ for further examples.

¹ See Straub, p. 47, de tropis et figuris quae inveniuntur in orationibus Demosthenis et Ciceronis.

² Kurtz, p. 309.

³ Ovid und sein verhältniss zu den vorgängern, Innsbruck, 1869.

FERRUM 4. Liv. 1, 59, 1 ferro, igni, quacumque dehinc vi possim; 2, 10, 4 ferro, igni, quacumque vi possint; Preuss, l. c., p. 35, considers these expressions proverbial.

FERULA, p. 135. Braulio ep. 11 (M. 80, 657 C) quia et nos iuxta Flaccum didicimus litterulas, et saepe manum ferulae subtraximus; compare Paulin. Aquil. apol. pro carm. (M. 99, 471) videris ob id forte meretriculam indignari Carmentem manumque ad ferulam mittere; Phil. Harv. ep. 13 (M. 203, 98 B) sub magistrali ferula teneremur.

FICTUS, p. 135. Lactant. inst. 6, 20, 7 picta et ficta et gemmis distincta.

FILIUS. Sid. Apoll. ep. 7, 14, 7 unde illud simile vulgatum est, quod ait quidam in causa dispari, sententia pari: filium Marci Ciceronis populus Romanus non agnoscebat loquentem.

FILIX, p. 136. The passage from Horace is cited by Alan. de Insul. lib. parab. 5 (M. 210, 592 A).

FILUM, p. 136. Coripp. Ioh. 3, 338 cur, Lachesis, hominum tenui pendentia filo | fata tenes? Hildebert. carm. misc. 1349 (M. 171, 1424 B) cites Ovid ex Pont. 4, 3, 35.

FLAMMA 1, p. 137. To Woelfflin's collection in the Sitzungsbd. d. Münch. Akad. phil.-hist., 1881, II, p. 55 and 57, and ALL. 3, 446, add Ovid met. 12, 551; 15, 441; Sidon. Apoll. c. 7, 249; Leo Magn. serm. 18, 56 (M. 54, 183 B); incert. Sax. poet. annal. gest. Car. Magn. 2 (M. 99, 703 B); compare Auson. ecl. 25, 2 (Peiper) ferro et face.

FLERE. Ennod. vit. Epiph., p. 382, 23 (H.) numquam ad flentem flens bene veniat consolator; Hier. ep. 39, 2 (M. 22, 466) non est optimus consolator quem proprii vincunt gemitus; Braulio ep. 30 (M. 80, 677 A); cf. Plaut. Epid. 111 nil agit qui diffidentem verbis solatur suis.

FLUCTUS, p. 138. Plaut. Mil. 513 dedecoris pleniorum erum faciam tuom, | quam magno vento plenumst undarum mare; Ovid trist. 5, 2, 28 quae si comprehendere coner, | Icariae numerum dicere coner aquae; Coripp. Ioh. 6, 201 numeres aut aequoris undas; Claudian. c. 18, 32 si pelagi fluctus, Libyae si discis harenas, | Eutropii numerabis eros; Apoll. Rhod. 4, 214; cf. Stat. silv. 3, 3, 97 hibernas citius numeraveris imbres | silvarumque comas.

FLUMEN 1, p. 138. Sidon. Apoll. ep. 1, 5, 6 in medio undarum sitiēbamus.

FLUMEN 2, p. 139. Hor. ep. 1, 2, 42 is cited by Ioh. Sar.

ep. 263 (M. 199, 305 D). The meaning of the proverb seems to be most closely connected with Apost. 1, 90 Ἀκασσαίου σελήνη or Ἡροδότου σκιά.¹

FLUMEN 3, p. 139. Ovid trist. 5, 11, 27 sed ut in mare flumina vastum, | sic solet exiguae currere rivus aquae; Stat. silv. 1, 4, 37 et in oceanum rivi cecidere minores; Alan. de Insul. lib. parab. 3 (M. 210, 586 A) ad vada Neptuni fontes et flumina currunt.

FLUMEN 5, p. 139. Ovid met. 13, 324 ante retro Simois fluet; Sil. Ital. 5, 253 Thrasydennus in altis | ascendet citius colles; Claud. c. 18, 353 prona petunt retro fluvii iuga; in Rufin. 1, 159; Greg. Cypr. Mosq. 1, 28 with Leutsch's note; Eustath. Il. 1067, 27²; J. Koch, p. 26.

FLUMEN 7, p. 139. Ovid ex Pont. 3, 7, 8 ne totiens contra, quam rapit amnis, eam; Ioh. Sar. ep. 179 (M. 199, 176 B) nec hoc dixerim quod eum velim aut suadeam dirigere brachia contra torrentem (= Iuven. 4, 89); Mantiss. 1, 15 ἀνὰ ῥοὺν χωρεῖν (see Leutsch's note); for the opposite idea, compare Diogen. 5, 82 κατὰ ῥοὺν φέρεται: ἐπὶ τῶν εὐπλοούντων.

FLUMEN 9, as a type of speed; Sedat. ep. ad Ruric. 8, p. 450, 14 (Eng.) celeritate ventos et flumina praecursum; Verg. Aen. 1, 317 Harpalyce volucremque fuga praevertitur Hebrum (Eurum, Ribb.); Serv. ad loc., unde et flumina dicitur celeritate transisse; Sil. Ital. 3, 307 cui sonipes cursu, cui cesserit incitus amnis, | tanta fuga est; 2, 73 Threiciae | . . . cursuque fatigant | Hebrum innupta manus, which is an evident imitation of the Vergilian passage.

FOLIUM 1, p. 140. Diomed. ars. gram. 2, p. 461, 23 (K.) cites the expression, leviorque foliis, as an example of hyperbole.

FOLIUM 4. Ovid met. 11, 615 quot . . . | silva gerit frondes; Stat. silv. 3, 3, 97 citius numeraveris imbres | silvarumque comas.

FONS 1, p. 140. Hier. praef. de spir. sanc. (M. 23, 104 A) et contemnet rivulos, cum coeperit haurire de fontibus; Maxim. Taur. homil. 84 (M. 57, 441 B) quis enim contentus est potare de rivulo, cum possit haurire de fontibus? Abaelard. ep. 10 (M. 178, 336 B) de ipso fonte Matthaeus, de rivulo fontis Lucas est potatus; Hildebert. carm. misc. 1348 (M. 171, 1422 D) cites Ovid ex Pont. 3, 5, 18.

FORMA 1, p. 141. See Kaibel, Hermes 17, 419.

[FORMA 3. Tibull. 1, 8, 24 forma nihil magicis utitur auxiliis,

¹ Wiesenthal, p. 20.

² Kurtz, p. 309.

Propert. 1, 2, 8 nudus amor formae non amat artificem; compare 2, 18, 25 ut natura dedit, sic omnis recta figurast; Ovid. rem. am. 350 forma sine arte decens; compare our English proverb 'Beauty unadorned.']

FORMICA 1, p. 141. Sid. Apoll. ep. 7, 14, 5 an industriam? cui pro suo modulo comparari nec formica formidat.

FORTUNA 1, p. 141. Ovid ex Pont. 4, 8, 16 praeter fortunam, quae mihi caeca fuit; Adalberon ep. 10 (M. 137, 508 D) caeca fortuna; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 3, 8 (M. 199, 490 B) cites the words noli fortunam, quae non est, dicere caecam; enthet. in Polycrat. (381 C) referring to Fortuna he says, 'dea caeca.'

FORTUNA 2, p. 142. Aper ap. Tac. dial. 23, 1 nolo, inridere rotam Fortunae¹; Sidon. Apoll. ep. 8, 11, 4 quo rerum volubilitatis humanae rota ducitur; c. 2, 348 fregit in illo | imperii fortuna rotas; Claud. ad lunam (PLM. III, p. 164, 16 Baehr.) ut volvat fortuna rotam; Ven. Hildebert. carm. misc. 1349 (M. 171, 1423 D) tempus, amor, fortuna rotam comitatur euntem; Petr. Cell. ad Thom. Cant. ep. 335 (M. 190, 678 A) irridet fortunam cum inversione rotae suae; Ioh. Sar. enthet. 255 (M. 199, 970 C) rota fortunae; compare Iul. Val. 2, 38, p. 109, 8 (K.) in illa versura Fortunae.

FORTUNA 5, p. 142. Curt. 4, 5, 2 numquam diu eodem vestigio stare Fortunam; 4, 14, 21 iactamur invicem varietate fortunae; compare Sen. ep. 98, 8 oblitus huius petauri quo humana iactantur; Ovid trist. 3, 11, 67 humanaeque memor sortis, quae tollit eosdem | et premit; Iul. Val. 1, 11, p. 21, 23 (K.) non enim vides, ut stare fortuna hominum nesciat; 2, 28, p. 98, 8 (K.); Sen. ep. 44, 4; Ioh. Sar. ep. 285 (M. 199, 321 B) alternat fortuna rerum vices; enthet. in Polycrat. (381 C) quod fortuna dedit, et quod dabit, est alienum, | auferet hoc totum, cum volet illa, tibi.

FORTUNA 9, p. 144. Coripp. Ioh. 1, 561 nam timidos fortuna premet, cautosque iuvabit | audacesque simul; 7, 57; incert. poet. annal. de gest. Car. Magn. II (M. 99, 698 A) virtutem, sicut solet, est fortuna secuta; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 7, 18 (M. 199, 684 D) audentes fortuna iuvat; Alan. de Insul. parab. 5 (M. 210, 590 D) audaces fortuna iuvat; for citations from Greek tragic poets, see H. Koch II, p. 5.

FORTUNA 13, p. 145. See H. Koch II, p. 5, for Greek citations.

FORTUNATUS. The Isles of the Blest appear to have formed

¹ See Gudeman's note.

the basis of proverbial expressions; Plaut. Trin. 549 sicut fortunatorum memorant insulas; compare Asin. 33 apud fustitudinas, ferricrepinas insulas; Cassiod. var. 12, 15, 7 alii dicant insulas, ego habitationes tuas appellem potius Fortunatas; Eumen. panegy. Constant. 7 (M. 8, 627 B) nec Thulen ultimam, nec ipsas, si quae sunt, Fortunatorum insulas dignabatur acquirere; Macar. 5, 81 μακάρων νῆσοι; Zenob. 3, 86, Cic. ad Att. 12, 3, 1, par. 1, 78, Plato symp. 179 E, 180 B, Hesiod ἐργ. καὶ ἥμ. 170; see A. Dieterich, Nekyia, Leipzig, 1893, p. 22, n. 2.

FORUM 1, p. 145. Cf. Ps.-Sen. ep. ad Paul. 12 feramus aequo animo et utamur foro, quod sors concessit.

FOVEA, p. 146. Prudent. apoth. praef. 13 scrobis latentis pronus in foveam ruet; Gelas. I adv. Pelag. haer. p. 412, 18 (Günther) foveas hostilis persuasionis incurrit.

FRAUS. Ovid a. a. 3, 491 iudice me fraus est concessa repellere fraudem; compare Publil. Syr. 582 remedium fraudem est contra vulpem quaerere; Zenob. 1, 70 ἀλωπεκίζειν πρὸς ἑτέραν ἀλώπεκα; see Leutsch-Schneidewin's note.

FRONS 2, p. 147. Ovid a. a. 3, 553 nec prima fronte rapaces | este; Cassiod. var. 7, 18, 1 errores . . . possumus prima fronte deprehendere; Ennod. ep. 5, 26, p. 146, 8 (H.) non urunt memoriam prima fronte negata beneficia; Phaedr. 4, 2, 6 decipit | frons prima multos; Maxim. Taur. hom. 109 (M. 57, 507 B) granum sinapis prima fronte specie sui est parvum; Ioan. Pict. ad Thom. Cant. ep. 467 (M. 190, 1034 B); Herv. ad Thom. Cant. ep. 366 (697 C) prima facie; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 7, prol. (M. 199, 637 A); Arnulf. Lexov. ep. 34 (M. 201, 62 D); Steph. Torn. ep. 200, (M. 211, 482 A) and ep. 224 (496 C); cf. Sen. d. 2, 3, 2 prima specie pulchrum; Curt. 9, 8, 20. These citations seem to indicate that the modern expression *prima facie* soon crowds out the late Latin *prima fronte*; compare the similar tendency in *toto pectore* and *toto corde*.

FULMEN 1, p. 148. Maecen. ap. Sen. ep. 19, 9 ipsa enim altitudo attonat summa; Macrobi. sat. 7, 8, 6 vento nimio abies aut quercus avellitur, cannam nulla facile frangit procella; Dracont. 5, 312 gramina non tangunt, feriunt sed fulmina quercus; Alan. de Insul. lib. parab. (M. 210, 584 A) impetus et venti, tonitrus et fulmina turres | flatibus evertunt; praef. Anticlaud. (485) cum fulminis impetus vires suas expendere dedignetur in virgula, verum audaces provectorum arborum expugnet casus; schol. ad Lucan. 1, 81 and Abaelard. ep. 1, 9 (M. 178, 148 C) cite Hor. c. 2, 10, 11

FULMEN 2, p. 148. Ovid rem. am. 369 is cited by Abaelard. ep. 1 (M. 178, 120 B); incert. auct. vit. myst. (M. 184, 668 D); Petr. Bles. ep. 80 (M. 207, 249 A).

FULMEN 3, Szel., p. 5. Sidon. Apoll. c. 23, 342 effundit celeres in arva currus; | non sic fulminis impetus trisulci | umquam sic . . . poli meatus | rupit; Ovid. am. 3, 4, 14 equum . . . | fulminis ire modo; Apul. met. 8, 4 impetu saevo frementis oris . . . totus fulmineus; Nazar. pan. Constant. 7 fulmineus miles; Petr. Dam. ep. 6, 23 (M. 144, 412 C) in medios hostium cuneos, velut emissus caelitus fulgor, irrumpe; 8, 1, (463 D) fulmineus in hostes irruere; see further the citations given by Woelfflin, ALL. 6, 456 (Plin. n. h. 2, 142; Verg. Aen. 5, 319; Lucan 5, 405; Stat. 11, 483; Auson. epist. 25 (21) v. 5; Claud. Eutrop. 2. 271 ocior sidere.)

FULMENTUM, p. 148. See Crusius, Herond., p. 33.

FUMUS 1, n., p. 149. With Pers. 5, 20 cf. Fronto, p. 211, 2 (Nab.) nihil serium potuisse fieri de fumo et pulvere; p. 228, 3 (Nab.) cum illa olim nugalia conscripsi, laudem fumi et pulveris; cf. Eustath. Il. 757, 31 τᾶλλ' ἐγὼ καπνοῦ σκιᾶς οὐκ ἂν πριαίμην¹; Soph. Antig. 1170.

FUMUS 3. Augustin. ep. 56, 2 (M. 33, 223) huius fumi vel vaporis temporalis, quae vita humana dicitur; Braulio ep. 34 (M. 80, 679 C) vita ista fugitiva et fumea; Petr. Dam. ep. 1, 20 (M. 144, 247 B) fumea vita volat; cf. Ioh. Sar. metal. 4, 35 (M. 199, 938 B) sed, ut fumus, evanescent; Hier. ep. 100, 1 instar fumi resolvuntur in nihilum.

FUNDUS 2, p. 149. Macrobi. sat. 7, 12, 13, citing Hesiod, cum ad medium dolii perventum est, comperendum; Sen. ep. 1, 5 is cited by Foliot ep. 130 (M. 190, 838 D) and by Petr. Bles. ep. 14 (M. 207, 45 A).

FURCA, p. 151. Hor. ep. 1, 10, 24 is cited by Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 3, 8 (M. 199, 489 C).

FURERE 1, p. 151. Boeth. p. 187, 30 (Peiper) contr. Eutych. et Nest. ne iure viderer insanus, si sanus inter furiosos haberi contenderem.

[GABII. Gabii and Fidenae are often mentioned as types of small and old-fashioned places; Hor. ep. 2, 1, 25 vel Gabiis vel cum rigidis aequata Sabinis; Iuven. 6, 57 vivat Gabiis, ut vixit in agro, | vivat Fidenis; Hor. ep. 1, 11, 7 Gabiis desertior atque | Fidenis vicus; the places are also mentioned together by Iuven. 10, 100 Fidenarum Gabiorumque . . . potestas].

¹ Kurtz, p. 319.

GADES, as one of the ends of the earth; Hor. c. 2, 2, 11 Libyam remotis | Gadibus iungas; c. 2, 6, 1 Septimi, Gadis aditure mecum; Iuven. 10, 1 omnibus in terris, quae sunt a Gadibus usque | Auroram et Gangem; Sen. n. q. 1 prol. 13 ab ultimis litoribus Hispaniae usque ad Indos; Sil. Ital. 1, 141 hominum finem Gades; Claudian. 8, 43 quantum distant a Tigride Gades; 3, 293 sed Latia quicquid ditione subactum | vivit, et a primis Ganges horrebat Hiberis; Stephan. Torn. ep. 22, (M. 211, 326 A) haec . . . Gades Oceano . . . commercio foederavit; Anacreontea 13, 25 (Bergk) καὶ τοὺς Γαδείρων ἐκτός, | τῶν Βακτρίων τε κινδῶν . . . ἔρωτας; Apost. 16, 19 τὰ γὰρ Γαδείρων οὐ περατά and Leutsch's note; Anthol. Pal. 11, 201, 2 ἔκτοθεν ἂν στηλῶν Ἑρακλείους ἔφυγον; 11, 209, 1; append. 1, 120, 2. In like manner note the use of *Tanais* in Propert. 2, 30, 2 tu licet usque | ad Tanain fugias, usque sequetur amor; Hor. c. 3, 10, 1 extremum Tanain si biberes, Lyce; Claudian. c. 8, 44.

GALLINA 1, p. 152. Eustath. Od. 1485, 30 γάλα ὀρνίθων; see Kurtz, p. 310, for Greek citations.

GALLUS 2. Sulpic. Sev. speaks several times of the gluttony of the Gauls; d. 1, 13, 4 etiam ad Gallorum pulmenta sufficiat; d. 1, 20, 4; 2, 8, 2 cum edacitatis argueris, Galli sumus; compare the remarks of Ammian. Marcell. 15, 12, 4 on their intemperance in the use of wine.

GALLUS 1, p. 152. Compare append. prov. 3, 53 κύων ἐν προθύρῳ: ἐπὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς δίκαισις τολμηρῶν; see Leutsch-Schneidewin's note.

GARGARA. Ovid a. a. 1, 57 Gargara quot seges; Verg. georg. 1, 103 ipsa suas mirantur Gargara messes; cf. AFRICA 2, p. 8, Otto.

GEMMA. Mart. 1, 109, 4 carior Indicis lapillis; Sp. Ven. Fort. in laud. Mar. 349 pulchra super gemmas; Augustin. serm. 37, 3 (M. 38, 223 A); Poet. Carol. II, p. 77; Alcuin ep. 175 (M. 100, 445); Cassiod. (M. 70, 1038 A) pretiosiores omnibus margaritis; Ioh. Sar. ep. 234 (M. 199, 263 B) omni topazio pretiosior; see Woelfflin, ALL. 6, 459 and cf. AURUM 1.

GERERE. Fronto ad Ant. 5, p. 102, 4 (Nab.) ante gestum, post relatum, aiunt qui tabulas sedulo conficiunt, is an expression cast in proverbial form; see Cic. de orat. 2, 280 and compare DEDUCTIO.

GERRAE, p. 153. Placid. gloss., p. 49 (D.) gerras, nugas ineptiasque; see ALL. 10, 378.

GLADIUS 2, p. 153. Wibald. Stab. ep. 22 (M. 189, 1144 B) insanis clavam porrigere; cf. Petr. Bles. ep. 18 (M. 207, 67 A) honor fatui, gladius in manus insani.

GLADIUS 3, p. 154. Columban. serm. 11, 2 (M. 80, 251 B) quando enim unusquisque mentitur, . . . seipsum proprio gladio iugulat; Ioh. Sar. ep. 99 (M. 199, 90 B) quia nihil turpius est quam suis armis expugnari, et quasi mucrone proprio iugulari; Polycrat. 5, 7 (554 D) vel eum suo mucrone iugules; Petr. Chrys. serm. 157 (M. 52, 615 C) hostem proprio mucrone turbare singulare est insigne virtutis; Lucian bis acc. 29 ἐπ' ἐμὲ τὴν ἐμὴν μάχαιραν ἀκονᾶν; compare Macar. 3, 85 ἐν τοῖς ἐμᾶντοῦ δικτύοις ἀλώσομαι (with Leutsch's note), Schmidt, l. c., p. 98; compare also Lact. instit. 5, 19, 1 primum quod se ipsos iugulant.¹

GRACULUS, p. 155. See Martin, l. c., p. 24, no. 32 a.

GRADUS, p. 155. Commod. instr. 2, 7, 9 aut ferro ligatus aut de suo gradu deiectus; cf. Hor. ep. 2, 2, 30 praesidium regale loco deiecit, ut aiunt; Sen. ep. 67, 10 illic est constantia, quae deici loco non potest.

GRAECUS 2, p. 156. Compare Verg. Aen. 2, 106 ignari . . . artisque Pelasgae; Maxim. eleg. 5, 39 Graiae tunc nescius artis.

GRAMEN. Ovid trist. 5, 1, 32 mollia quot Martis gramina campus habet; Alcuin ep. 134 (M. 100, 374 A) gramina quot tellus habeat, vel littus arenas.

GRANDO. Ovid met. 5, 158 tela volant hiberna grandine plura.

GRANUM. Ovid ex Pont. 4, 15, 8 quot . . . | Punica sub lento cortice grana rubent; trist. 5, 2, 24; cf. Hildebert. carm. misc. 1130 (M. 171, 1403 C) habet . . . non tot grana seges, crimina quot species.

GUBERNATOR, p. 156. Sen. d. 1, 4, 5 gubernatorem in tempestate, in acie militem intellegas; 6, 5, 5 ne gubernatoris quidem artem tranquillum mare et obsequens ventus ostendit; Cypr. de mortal. 12 gubernator in tempestate dinoscitur, in acie miles probatur; Ps.-Publil. Syr. 368 tranquillo quivis est gubernator mari; compare Othlo lib. prov. 12 (M. 146, 319 A) militis cuiuslibet fortitudo non agnoscitur nisi in bello (cf. Sen. d. 1, 4, 5 above); Ovid trist. 3, 11, 21 in causa facili cuivis licet esse disertum; Plin. ep. 9, 26, 4 ideo nequaquam par gubernatoris est virtus, cum placido et cum turbato mari vehitur.

GUTTA 1, p. 156. Plaut. Rud. 435 quem nisi oras, guttam non

¹ See Brandt-Laubmann's index under *proverbia*.

feres; 437; Ennod. ep. 3, 24, p. 89, 22 (H.) vix arentis gutta fundatur eloquii; Augustin. ep. 110, 5 (M. 33, 421) vix mihi paucissimae guttae temporis stillantur; Sen. clem. 1, 11, 3 nullam te . . . stillam cruoris humani misisse; compare Lact. instit. 5, 2, 9 ad veritatem, cuius ille ne scintillam quidem unam vidisset aliquando.

GUTTA 1, n. 2, p. 156. Arnob. adv. nat. 2, 49, p. 87, 6 (Reiff.) nec mare continuo dulce est, si mitioris aquae guttas alicuius adieceris; Pacian. ep. 3, 25 (M. 13, 1080 B) nonne ut stillicidia fontibus magnis? nonne, ut ab oceano quaedam gutta, sorberis?

GUTTA 2, p. 156. Ovid ex Pont. 4, 10, 5 is cited by Wippo prov. (M. 142, 1264).

GUTTA 4. Coripp. Ioh. 6, 202 numeres . . . | nimborum aut guttas; in laud. Iust. 3, 358; Cassiod. var. 1, 10, 4 quantitate innumerabili harena maris, guttae pluviarum, stellae lucidae concluduntur; compare GRANDO.

HABERE 1, p. 157. Ioh. Sar. ep. 237 (M. 199, 267 A) percelebre est: quantum quisque sua nummorum fundit ab arca, | tantum habet et fidei; in Polycrat. 4, 5 (521 D) he cites Ovid f. 1, 217; with the general thought compare Hor. sat. 2, 5, 8 et genus et virtus, nisi cum re, vilior alga est; Sen. ep. 115, 10 quaerimus non quale sit quidque, sed quanti; Pind. Isth. 2, 11 χρήματα, χρήματ' ἀνὴρ.

HABERE 3, p. 157. Medea trag. 374 (PLM. 4, 234 Baehr.) hoc habet; Prudent. psych. 53 'hoc habet,' exclamat victrix regina.

HABERE 4, p. 157. Plaut. Amphitr. 927 tibi habeas res tuas, reddas meas; Ennod. ep. 2, 12, p. 52, 14 (H.) tibi habe facetias tuas; Arnob. adv. nat. 5, 7; tibi haec habe 5, 13.

HAMUS 1, p. 158. Evagr. sent. (M. 20, 1184 B) quem ad modum enim si quis glutiat hamum, sic abstrahetur anima tua; see Rowe, l. c., p. 18, Schmidt, l. c., pp. 86 and 88.

HARENA 1, p. 159. Coripp. Ioh. 6, 201 numeres . . . | quantas litus harenas | alluit; in laud. Iust. 3, 358; incert. Sax. poet. (M. 99, 731 C) amplior est numero, quam sit harena maris; Alcuin ep. 134 (M. 100, 374 A) quot . . . habeat littus arenas; compare Pind. Olymp. 2, 108 ἐπεὶ ψάμμος ἀριθμὸν περιπέφενγεν; Diogen. 2, 27 ἄμμον μετρέειν; Varro ταφὴ Μενίππου 12, ψαρμακόσιοι; incert. frag. 7 (Riese); cf. also Macrobian. sat. 5, 20, 13; see Blaydes' note on Aristoph. Acharn. 3.

HARENA 4, p. 159. Petr. Dam. ep. 1, 15 (M. 144, 233 C) divinam imploro clementiam ut . . . sterile arenosi littoris aratrum mihi de

manibus tollas; Gillebert. ep. 1 (M. 184, 289 B) inutile siquidem arenae mandare semina; Steph. Torn. suppl. ep. 10 (M. 211, 548 D) tamquam laterem lavantes, et seminantes in arena; cf. Alan. de Insul. lib. parab. (M. 210, 581 B) in sterili steriles aratrum facit aggere sulcos; de planc. nat. (431 B). Duff on Iuven. 1, 155 et latum media sulcum deducis harena, gives this interpretation but, it seems to me, incorrectly.

HARENA 5, p. 160. See Leutsch on Greg. Cypr. Mosq. 3, 46; Apost. 7, 50, and Martin, p. 23.

HERBA 3. Plaut. Trin. 31 mores mali | quasi herba inrigua succrevire uberrume, sounds proverbial.

HERCULES 1, p. 162. Coripp. Ioh. 7, 378 Herculeis . . . viribus; Anthol. Pal. 9, 281, 4 δίξημαι δεύτερον Ἡρακλῆα; 11, 95, 4; Eustath. Il. 589, 42 ἄλλος οὗτος Ἡρακλῆς¹; see Wiesenthal, p. 46 and cf. the expression in Iuven. 2, 20 verbis | Herculis, used in reference to the doctrines of the stoics.

HERCULES 1, n., p. 162. See Wiesenthal, p. 58, for Greek references.

HERCULES 5, p. 163. Hildebert. ep. 2, 22 (M. 171, 234 C) et tanquam Herculi clavam de manibus extorquentes; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 7, 13 (M. 199, 667 A) longe maius quam, ut fabularum utamur verbis, clavam eripere de manu Herculis; Petr. Bles. ep. 141 (M. 207, 423 B) leviusque profecto extorquerem clavam de manu Herculis.²

[HERCULES 7. Steph. Torn. uses frequently the alliterative proverb commisit tamquam Hylam Herculi iungens, ep. 2, 114 (M. 211, 404 A), which probably goes back to earlier times; compare ep. 2, 121 (409 B) ubi tanquam Hylas mirabar Herculem; ep. 2, 148, (435 C) nam sicut Hylas Herculem, non aequis eos passibus consecramur; Ioh. Sar. Metal. 1, 3 (M. 199, 829 A) Hylam . . . ab Hercule.]

HERCULES 8. Ovid ex Pont. 3, 3, 100 pectus et Herculeae simplicitatis habes, points to a possible proverb.

HERCULES 9. The *termini* (or *vestigia*) *Herculis et Liberi patris* appears to be a quasi-proverbial phrase denoting wide extent and remote distance; see Curt. 3, 10, 5; 9, 4, 21; Sen. ben. 7, 3, 1; ep. 94, 63; compare GADES.

¹ Kurtz, p. 308.

² Compare Prudent. ham. 402 hinc gerit Herculeam vilis sapientia clavam; Hier. ep. 70, 3 rabidum canem . . . Herculis clava percutiam; Thom. Cant. ep. 19 (M. 190, 466 A) quasi clava Herculeae percussi et repulsi.

HERMUS. Claudian. 3, 103 stagna rubentis | aurea Pactoli; totumque exhauserit Hermum; 18, 214 ut eunucho flueret Pactolus et Hermus? 20, 172 Hermus et aurata Pactolus inhorruit urna; 24, 232; compare PACTOLUS and TAGUS.

HESPERIDES, Sonny ALL. 8, 487. Ovid met. 11, 114 demptum tenet arbore pomum, | Hesperides donasse putes; cf. Claudian. c. 29, 177.

HIPPOLYTUS, p. 164. For Greek parallels, see Wiesenthal, p. 55.

HOMO 2, p. 165. Suet. citing Vespasian, Vesp. 13 ego tamen vir sum; Salv. de gubn. dei 3, 1, 3, p. 42, 12 (Pauly) homo sum, non intellego secreta dei; CIL. 11, 856 (Carm. Epigr. 191, 7 B.) sumus mortales, immortales non sumus; Sen. ep. 116, 7 nos homunciones sumus, omnia nobis negare non possumus: see Crusius, Herond. pp. 101 and 111.

HOMO 3, p. 165. Augustin. serm. 164 (M. 38, 901 D) humanum fuit errare; Ps.-Baeda lib. prov. (M. 90, 1098) humanum est peccare; Petr. Dam. serm. 17, 90 (M. 144, 599 D) peccare quippe humanum est; Othlo lib. prov. 8 (M. 146, 313 B) humanum est peccare; Ter. Adel. 579 censen hominem me esse? erravi; for Greek parallels, see H. Koch II, p. 20; cf. append. anthol. Pal. 2, 52, 9 μηδὲν ἀμαρτεῖν ἴσσι θεῶν. Cf. Dem. 18, 289.

HOMO 4, p. 165. Ter. Heaut. 77 is cited by Augustin. ep. 155, 14 (M. 33, 672); Ioh. Sar. ep. 206 (M. 199, 229 D) humanum, teste comico, nihil charitas a se reputat alienum; ep. 281 (317 B); Polycrat. 3, prol. (477 B).

HOMO 6, p. 166. Optat. Mil. 3, 3, p. 78, 15 (Z) nec homo inter homines esse voluit; see Crusius, Herond. p. 100; cf. Tac. h. 4, 64 liberi inter liberos eritis.

HOMO 7, p. 166. With Petron. 38, phantasia, non homo, compare Zacchaeus Christ. consult. 1, 9 (M. 20, 1078 B) nec praestigiorum more phantasiam pro homine monstrari.

HOMO 9, p. 166. Ioh. Sar. metal. 2, 18 (M. 199, 876 C) ut verbo comico utar: fere quot homines, tot sententiae; compare Mart. 6, 56, 5 scis multos dicere multa; anthol. Pal. 11, 283, 1 πολλοὶ πολλὰ λέγουσιν.

HONOS 1, p. 167. Ovid trist. 5, 14, 16 ad te non parvi venit honoris onus; Iulian. Pom. 1, 25, 1 non honorari sed onerari (see C. Blümlein, ALL. 8, 586, also Woelfflin, ALL. 1, 578); Foliot ep. 43 (M. 190, 777 A) mihi nec onus augeretur, nec vobis honor . . . minueretur; Nicol. Clar. ep. 40 (M. 196, 1639 C)

oneri, non honori; Petr. Bles. ep. 242 (M. 207, 554 C) hanc onus reputa, non honorem; Steph. Torn. ep. 3, 267 (M. 211, 528 A) annexum est onus honori; ep. 2, 146 (432 D) sic honorastis et onerastis ut et honor non deficiat ex onere et onus proficiat ex honore.

HORA 1, p. 167.¹ Ter. Phorm. 514 unam praeterea horam ne oppertus sies; Hor. sat. 2, 7, 112 adde quod idem | non horam tecum esse potes; Hier. ep. 54, 9 unius horae spatio commutatur; for the phrase *horae momento*, see Hor. sat. 1, 1, 8; Liv. 5, 7, 3; Plin. n. h. 7, 51, 172.²

HOSTIS 1, p. 168. Incert. Sax. poet. (M. 99, 691 A) est dictum: dolus an virtus, quis in hoste requirat?

HOSTIS 2, p. 168. Ovid met. 4, 428 is cited by Abaelard. ep. 8 (M. 178, 284 D); Petr. Ven. ep. 4, 21 (M. 189, 349 B) verum est quod dicitur, etc.; and by Petr. Bles. ep. 91 (M. 207, 286 B).

HYACINTHUS. Iuven. 6, 110 facit hoc illos Hyacinthos; compare ENDYMION.

HYBLA 1, p. 168. Claudian. 14, 8 Hyblaeos latebris nec spoliati favos.

HYBLA 2, p. 168. Claudian. rapt. Proserp. 2, 125 Hyblaeum . . . thymum.

HYMETTUS, p. 169. Anthol. Pal. 7, 36, 4 Ὑμηττεῖο λειβόμενος μέλιτι; 11, 341, 2 ἀλλὰ κακῶς εἰπεῖν, Ἀττικόν ἐστὶ μέλι.

HYPERBOREUS. To Sonny ALL. 8, 487 add Hor. c. 2, 20, 16 Hyperboreosque campos; for the Hyperborean cold, compare Sidon. Apoll. c. 11, 96 Hyperboreis . . . pruinis; Val. Flacc. 8, 210; Claudian. 24, 256; 5, 240 vel Hyperboreo damnatam sidere Thylen.

IACERE, p. 169. Sen. ep. 105, 2 etiam in acie iacens praeteritur, cum stante pugnatur; compare Petr. Dam. ep. 1, 15, 25 (M. 144, 228) et fortis ac ingenuus quisque bellator, vitat inermem, impetit adversum se tela vibrantem; Dracont. 5, 311 et praedam rabies contemnit fulva iacentem; see Otto, CALCARE, p. 64.

ICTUS 1. Sil. Ital. 8, 309 stat campis acies, exspectaturque sub ictu | alter Flaminius; Cypr. ep. 57, 1 pacem sub ictu mortis acciperent; Augustin. ep. 137, 8 (M. 33, 519) in ictu temporis; Paulin. Nol. ep. 13, 14, p. 96, 4 (H): in ictu oculi; Theobald. Stamp. ep. 1 (M. 163, 760 A) in ictu oculi; Petr. Bles. ep. 153

¹ See Rhodius II, p. 5, de L. Munati Planci sermone, Bautzen, 1896.

² For the use of *hora* to express length of time, see Ter. Eun. 341 dum haec dicit, abiit hora; Hor. sat. 1, 5, 14 with Fritzsche's note.

(M. 207, 447 C) sub ictu oculi; Aldh. ep. 4 (M. 89, 96 A) momentaneoque ictu apprehendi; Petr. Dam. serm. 6, 26 (M. 144, 532 B) in brevissimi temporis ictu; Nicol. Clar. ep. 7 (M. 196, 1602 A) in uno capillulo et ocelluli scintillatione; Eustath. opusc. 6, 7 *τάχιον ἢ ἀναμύσσεινα*; Kurtz, p. 319.

ICTUS 2. Claudian. 18, 50 unoque sub ictu | eripit officium patris nomenque mariti; Ps.-Cypr. de sing. cler. 19, p. 195, 14 (H.) utrumque semel uno ictu mortificat; Boeth. consol. phil. 5, 6, p. 144 (Peiper) uno ictu; compare Otto, DUO 2.

IGNIS 2, p. 170. Evagr. sent. (M. 20, 1183 B) sicut enim aurum et argentum probat ignis; Columban. monost. 179 (M. 80, 291) aurum flamma probat, homines tentatio iustos; Othlo lib. prov. 19 (M. 146, 334 C) tamquam fornacis rutilans aurum probat ignis; Petr. Pap. ad Thom. Cant. ep. 459 (M. 190, 1021 D) Christi miles tamquam aurum in fornace probatur.

IGNIS 3. Ovid a. a. 1, 244 is cited by Helois. ad Abaelard. ep. 6 (M. 178, 214 B); anthol. Pal. 9, 749, 2 *μὴ πυρὶ πῦρ ἔπαγε*; append. 3, 171, 6 *ἔστι τὸ οὐκ οὐτὸς τῷ πυρὶ πῦρ ἕτερον*.

IGNIS 5, p. 171. Anthol. Pal. 12, 139, 2 *πῦρ ὑπὸ τῇ σποδιῇ*.

IGNIS 6, p. 171. Stat. Theb. 2, 455 nil tela nec ignes | obstiterint; Curt. 4, 1, 18 quod alii per ignes ferrumque peterent; Petr. Dam. serm. 32 (M. 144, 676) per gladios, per tela, per ignes; Hildebert. carm. misc. 1330 (M. 171, 1403 D) ruens per tela, per ignes; Ioh. Sar. ep. 247 (M. 199, 292 B) per tela, et per ignes et ultimae vitae discrimina; Polycrat. 7, 9 (656 C) per tela, per ignes.

IGNIS 9. Fronto, p. 202, 3 (Nab.) sicut ignem, quamvis magnum, vel levis aura si adflaverit, adiuverit, sounds proverbial.

ILIAS, p. 171. Add Eustath. Il. 1, 22 *Ἰλιάς κακῶν*; Kurtz, p. 313.

INCENDIUM, 5. Hor. ep. 1, 18, 85 et neglecta solent incendia sumere viris.

INCITUS, p. 173. See further Tribukait, p. 55, n. 2.

INCUBARE, p. 173. Maxim. Taur. homil. 82 (M. 57, 431 C) nec ipsis bene est qui recondito auro incubant.

INDIA, p. 174. Add Mart. 1, 109, 4 Issa est carior Indicis lapillis; 10, 38, 5 Propert. 2, 22, 10; 3, 4, 2; 3, 13, 6; Coripp. in laud. Iust. 3, 15; Soph. Antig. 1038; Eustath. opusc. 61, 75 *τὰ Ἰνδικὰ χρυσία*; see Kurtz, p. 311.

INGENIUM. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 7, 15 (M. 199, 673 A) nam, ut dici solet, amor ingenii numquam hominem divitem fecit, is perhaps a much older proverb.

INNOCENTIA. Caecil. in Apul. apol. 5, p. 390 (H.) innocentiam

eloquentiam esse; Tac. dial. 11 nam statum cuiusque ac securitatem melius innocentia tuetur quam eloquentia; compare Diogen. 7, 87 *προφάσεως δέεται μόνον ἡ πονηρία*; Sen. ep. 49, 12 veritatis simplex oratio est (= Eurip. Phoen. 469 *ἀπλοῦς ὁ μῦθος τῆς ἀληθείας ἔφν*).

INVIDIA, p. 176. Fronto, p. 209, 19 (Nab.) sed profecto sicut arborum altissimas vehementius ventis quati videmus, ita virtutes maximas invidia criminosius insectatur; cf. Curt. 4, 5, 2 semperque homines, quantamcunque felicitatem habeant, invidiam tamen sentire maiorem (Mützell ad loc.); Othlo lib. prov. 19 (M. 146, 336 B) virtus semper invidiae patet; Ps.-Baeda lib. prov. (M. 90, 1112).

IOCUS, p. 176. Sen. d. 7, 12, 2 miscent . . . et interponunt vitae ut ludum iocumque inter seria; Rufin. Aquil. apol. 1, 313 (M. 21, 546 A) ut ei mos est, miscuit seriis ridicula et ludicra; Mart. Dum. de form. hon. vit. 4, 7 miscebis interdum seriis iocos; Ioh. Sar. enthet. in Polycrat. (M. 199, 381 B) sic aptes seria ludis; Petr. Cell. ep. 69 (M. 202, 515 A) miscuisti siquidem iocos seriis; see ALL. 9, 65.

IRUS, p. 177. Epictetus in Macrob. sat. 1, 11, 45 *καὶ πενήν Ἴρος*; under Diogen. 8, 53 Schneidewin cites Liban. ep. 487 *θεοὺς τιμῶν δέξεται ἂν Ἴρος γενέσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ μὴ τιμῶν Κινύρας*; see Wiesenthal, p. 49.

IUPPITER 1, p. 178. Hor. c. 1, 12, 13 quid prius dicam solitis parentis | laudibus; Aratus cited in Macrob. sat. 1, 18, 15 *ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχώμεσθα*; Pind. Nem. 2, 3; Eurip. Hel. 1024; Terpand. frag. 1 (Bergk) *Ζεῦ, πάντων ἀρχά, | πάντων ἀγῆτωρ, | Ζεῦ, σοὶ σπένδω | ταύταν ὕμνων ἀρχάν*.¹

IUPPITER 3, p. 179. Ioh. Sar. Metal. 1, 3 (M. 199, 828 D) audienda quidem felicibus et, ut dici solet, auribus Iovis.

IUPPITER 7. Plaut. Merc. 956 tam propitiam reddam quam quom propitiast Iuno Iovi, sounds proverbial.

IUPPITER 8. Jove as the embodiment of wealth; Plaut. Pseud. 628 si . . . promptas thensauros Iovis, | tibi libellam argenti numquam credam; cf. anthol. Pal. 5, 34, 1-2 *ὁ Ζεὺς τὴν Δανάην χρυσοῦ, καὶ γὰρ δὲ σέ χρυσοῦ* | *πλείονα γὰρ δοῦναι τοῦ Διὸς οὐ δύναμαι*, of happiness; Sen. ep. 110, 18 Iovi ipsi controversiam de felicitate faciamus; ep. 25, 4 cum ipso Iove de felicitate contendat; cf. Otto, DEUS 5.

IUS 1, p. 179. Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 3, 11 (M. 199, 499 C) econtra in praetorio saepe summum ius summa iniuria est.

¹Linde, p. 26, de proverbiorum apud tragicos Graecos usu, Gotha, 1896.

IUS 2, p. 180. Solon (?) frag. 30 (Bergk) ἀρχῶν ἄκουε καὶ δικαίως καδίκως; see H. Koch II, p. 23; compare Propert. 2, 4, 6 dehinc domiti post haec aequa et iniqua ferunt; cf. DIGNUS.

LABES. Verg. Aen. 2, 97 hinc mihi prima mali labes, appears to have become a proverbial quotation; Iustin. 17, 1, 5 haec illi prima mali labes. It also occurs twice in Gualbert. act. 285 (M. 146, 921 B) and 272 (917 A).

LABOR 2, p. 181. Verg. georg. 1, 145 is cited by Ioh. Sar. metal. 1, 6 (M. 199, 833 D); compare AMARE 1.

LABOR 3, p. 181. Hier. ep. 14, 10 at nemo athleta sine sudore coronatur.

LABRUM 2, p. 182. Incert. auct. paneg. Messall. 202 vel bene sit notus, summo vel inhaereat ore; Auson. ep. 14, 98 nil quaero, nisi quod labris tenetur, Zosim. pap. de reb. Pelag. 45, 3 nec hoc contenti, utrum haec, quae scripsisset, corde loqueretur an labiis; Gaufrid. ep. 30 (M. 205, 855 D) nolo enim litteras de summo ore stillantes; cf. Rufin. anthol. Pal. 5, 14, 3 ψαύει δ' οὐκ ἄκροισ τοῖς χεῖλεσιν. On Otto's note 1, p. 182, see Crusius, Herond., p. 182.

LABYRINTHUS, p. 183. For Greek parallels see Schmidt, l. c., p. 48.

LAC 1, p. 183. Sidon. Apoll. ep. 1, 2, 3 lactea cutis; anthol. Lat. N. 727 R. (II, 185, 4) albi lacte magis; see further Woelfflin, ALL. 6, 457.

LAC 2, p. 183. Compare the Greek proverb σῦκῳ . . . σῦκον οὐδὲ ἐν | οὕτως ὁμοιον γίγονεν cited by Cic. ad Attic. 4, 8a, 1.

LAC 5. Varro sat. Menipp. Prom. lib. 10 (B.) Chrysandalos locat sibi amiculum de lacte et cera Tarentina quam apes Milesiae coegerint; Apul. met. 10, 22 lacte et melle confecta membra. The joining of *lac* and *mel* was very common in late and medieval Latin because of the biblical parallel; note the phrase, lac et mel sub lingua; Petr. Cell. ep. 69 (M. 202, 515 A); Gaufrid. ep. 23 (M. 205, 849 D); Steph. Torn. serm. (M. 211, 569 A); with Orient. common. 2, 156 lacte et melle simul flumina plena, compare Ovid met. 1, 111 flumina iam lactis, iam flumina nectaris ibant.

[LAC 6. Plaut. Bacch. 1134 quae nec lac[tem] nec lanam ullam habent, is a proverb according to Hartung, p. 17 (Ueber die sprichwörter, besonders die lateinischen), whose view is favored by the alliteration.]

LACONICUS, p. 184. Compare Theokr. 18, 47 Δωριστί; see Tribukait, p. 41.

LAPIS 1, p. 185. Steph. pap. II, ep. 7 (M. 89, 1012 B) ipsi lapides, si dici potest, tribulationem nostram . . . flerent; Paul. pap. I, ep. 1 (M. 89, 1136 C) et ipsi lapides, si dici potest, nobis conflentes lacrymaverunt; anthol. Pal. 7, 599, 5 *τίς λίθος οὐκ ἐγόησεν, ὅτ' ἐξήρπαξεν ἐκείνην | εὐρυβίης Ἀΐδης*.

LAPIS 2, p. 185. Sid. Apoll. ep. 2, 8, 2 sufficit saxo carmen saxeum contineri; Paulin. Nol. ep. 12, 2, p. 74, 12 (H.) sum enim et ego unus de lapidibus vel iumentis illis quorum praefiguratione asina tunc locuta est; Paulin. Petr. vit. Mart. 1, 31 si quem recipit mens saxeae sensum; Firm. Mat., p. 112, 14 (Halm) tu insensibile corrigis saxum; Ioh. Sar. metal. 1, 3 (M. 199, 829 C) obtusior plumbo vel lapide; Plat. Gorg. 494 A *τὸ ὡσπερ λίθον ζῆν*; see Schmidt, p. 122.

LAPIS 8. Foliot Ep. 137 (M. 190, 845 A) quod equidem obtinere sapienti non erit difficile, qui lapidem noverit omnem movere; compare the Greek proverb *πάντα λίθον κινῶ* (Zenob. 5, 63; Macar. 7, 4) which is cited by Pliny, ep. 1, 20, 16; anthol. Pal. 5, 40, 5.

LAPIS 9. Apul. flor. 1, 9, p. 36 gemmam et aurum iuxta ac plumbum et lapillos nulli aestimare; Zacch. Christ. consult. 3, 9, (M. 20, 1164 D) gemma pro lapide est; compare Otto, LUTUM 5.

LAPIS 10. Lactant. instit. 2, 3, 3 quid eo facias, qui cum errare se sentiat, ultro ipse in lapides inpingat; see Brandt-Laubmann's index under *proverbia*.

LAQUEUS 1, p. 187. Plaut. Truc. 671 conlapsus est hic in corruptelam suam; incert. auct. trag. Agam. 633 et licuit dolos | versare, ut ipsi | fraude sua caderent Pelasgi; Euseb. Pamph. vit. Constant. 1, 38 (M. 8, 26 A) scrobem aperuit atque effodit, et in foveam quam fecit ipse incidet; compare Prov. 26, 27; Maxim. Taur. homil. 87 (M. 57, 452 C) dum aliena fraudulenter diripiunt, foveam suae perditionis effodiunt; Gualbert. act. 211 (M. 146, 893 B) nobis laqueum foveamque paramus.

LAQUEUS 1, n., p. 187. Ovid her. 20 (21) 206 qui mihi tendebas retia.

LAQUEUS 2, p. 187. Sen. ep. 22, 3 sed illud idem existimo, leni eundum via, ut, quod male inplicuisti, solvas potius quam abrumpas, dummodo, si alia solvendi ratio non erit, vel abrumpas; Avit. Vienn. ep. 1, p. 118, 1 (Chev.) sed rumpenda sunt interdum vincula necessitatum; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. prol. 1 (M. 199, 386 B) aut rumpo funem, si alias solvi non potest; ep. 292 (336 D) funem, si alias solvi non potest, rumpens.

LAQUEUS 3. Flav. Charis., p. 33, 20 (Keil) in retes meas inci-

disti, adding, in consuetudine dicimus; cf. Gualbert. act. 65 (M. 146, 790 A) in captionis laqueo deprehensum.

LATER, p. 187. Paulin. Nol. ep. 32, 23, p. 298, 9 ne luteis aedificiis operum sordidorum laterem, ut aiunt, lavemus; Hildebert. (M. 171, 1453 C) et later ablutus non erit absque luto; Petr. Bles. ep. 123 (M. 207, 362 C) sic lavo laterem; Steph. Torn. suppl. ep. 10 (M. 211, 548) tamquam laterem lavantes et seminantes in arena; Eustath. opusc. 11, 92 πλύνθον πλύνειν; see Kurtz, p. 318.

LEO 2, p. 189. Compare Nicol. Clar. ep. 35 (M. 196, 1628 C) illos duos loquor, vulpes astu, fastu leones; Cic. offic. 1, 13, 41 is cited by Pacianus ep. 2 (M. 13, 1058 B); cf. Greg. Cypr. Mosq. 1, 83.

LEO 3, p. 189. Compare append. sent. 274 (Ribb.) domi tyranni saepe servi sunt foris; Sidon. Apoll. ep. 1, 6, 2 cum sis alacer domi, in aggredienda peregrinatione trepidum; Eustath. Il. 1349, 25 οἴκοι λέοντες, see Kurtz, p. 316; Leutsch on Greg. Cypr. Mosq. 1, 83; Blaydes on Aristoph. Pax 1189; on the use of λέων in Greek for a brave man, see J. Koch, l. c., p. 23.

LEPUS 5, as swift; Plaut. Pers. 436 citius extemplo foro | fugiunt quam ex porta ludis quom emissus lepus; Phaedr. 1, 9, 4 leporem obiurgabat passer: ubi pernecitas | nota? Ioh. Sar. enthet. in Polycrat. (M. 199, 383 A) leporesque fugaces.

LETHE, p. 192. Ovid a. a. 3, 340 nec mea Lethaeis scripta dabuntur aquis; trist. 1, 8, 36 cunctane Lethaeis mersa feruntur aquis? 4, 1, 47 utque soporiferae biberem si pocula Lethes; ex Pont. 4, 1, 17; Prudent. cath. 6, 15 totis bibit medullis | obliviale poculum. | serpit per omne corpus | Lethaea vis.

LEX 1, p. 192. Compare Tac. ann. 3, 27 et corruptissima re publica plurimae leges; Germ. 19 plusque ibi boni mores valent quam alibi bonae leges.

LICET 1, p. 193. Publil. Syr. 393 nil magis amat cupiditas, quam quod non licet; Ovid am. 3, 4, 17 is a favorite quotation in Ioh. Sar. ep. 68 (M. 199, 54 D); ep. 249 (293 D) fidem habendam esse proverbio: nitimur etc.; Polycrat. 1, 6 (403 B); 8, 24 (819 B); Abaelard. ep. 8 (M. 178, 293 D); Ovid am. 2, 19, 3 is also cited by Ioh. Sar. ep. 273 (M. 199, 312 B); compare his remark, Polycrat. 1, 6 (403 B), aquae furtivae dulciores Prov. 9, 17 with Greg. Cypr. 1, 98 γλυκεῖ ὁπώρα φύλακος ἐκλελοιπότες.

LIGNUM. Cato de suo sump., p. 37, 18 (Jord.) enim vero usque istuc ad lignum dele, quoted by Fronto ep. ad Ant. 1, 2, p.

100, 17 (Nab.); cf. Hier. ep. 9, 1 imis, ut aiunt, ceris eraseris; see ATTONDERE, Otto, p. 45.

LINEA 3, p. 194. With Otto's remarks compare Placid. gloss., p. 28 (D.) conspicillo, ita ut conspici possunt, quod aiunt 'longis lineis'; see Sonny, ALL. 9, 67-8; with the note cf. Eurip. Antig. frag. 169 (N.) ἐπ' ἄκραν ἤκομεν γραμμὴν κακῶν; Prudent. apoth. 812 manet virtus, cui linea deficit | ultima.

LILIUM, p. 193. Herond. 7, 27; see Crusius, p. 133.

LINGUA 1, p. 195. To Jahn's citations in his note on Pers. 5, 1, add Caecil. 128 (Ribb.) si linguas decem habeam; Ovid trist. 1, 5, 53; met. 8, 532; Apul. met. 11, 25; Sidon. Apoll. c. 23, 459; Sedul. carm. pasch. 1, 99, p. 23 (Huem.); 1, 2, p. 181, 8; Ennod. ep. 9, 29; Claudian. c. 28, 436; Orient. 1, 387; cited by Hier. ep. 66, 5; 123, 17; Licent. ad Augustin. ep. 263 (M. 33, 106); Alcuin ep. 186 (M. 100, 458 A); Gualbert. act. 34 (M. 146, 779 B); Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 6, 28 (M. 199, 636 A).

LINGUA 2, p. 195. Petr. Dam. serm. 36, 180 (M. 144, 695) tunc deinde probatum est verum esse quod dicitur; vox populi, vox Dei.

LUCRETIA, Szel. p. 12, as a prude; Mart. 1, 90, 5 esse videbaris, fateor, Lucretia nobis.

LUCRUM 3, p. 197. Ps.-Baeda lib. prov. (M. 90, 1100 D) lucrum sine damno alterius fieri non potest; Othlo lib. prov. 11 (M. 146, 317 A).

LUPUS 1, p. 198. See Schmidt, p. 112 for Greek parallels.

LUPUS 3, p. 198. Cf. Licent. apud. Augustin. ep. 26, 3 (M. 33, 105) esuriens vitulos alet ante leaena sequaces | atque impasta diu teneros lupa nutriet agnos; Cassiod. var. 2, 40, 6 iuxta praedonem suum praeda gaudebat; Claud. rapt. Proserp. 2, prol. 26 vicinumque lupo praebuit agna latus; see Tribukait, p. 25; Apost. 14, 96 πρὶν κεν λύκος δὴν ποιμαῖνοι; see also Martin, p. 28, no. 70.

LUPUS 3, n., p. 198. Ovid met. 1, 505 sic agna lupum | . . . fugiunt; a. a. 1, 118 utque fugit visos agna novella lupos.

LUPUS 5, p. 198. Ennod. vit. Ant., p. 389, 23 (H.) ne lupum ovibus, agnis viperam negligens aestimator adiungas; Pacian. ep. 3, 19 (M. 13, 1076 B) dicis, ex lege coelesti . . . nec communicare lupis agnos; Synod. Chalcedon. ad Leo. Magn. ep. 98, 2 (M. 54, 953) eos vero qui lupi demonstrati sunt super oves imposuit (τοὺς δὲ λύκους ἀποδεδειγμένους τοῖς προβάτοις ἐπέστησε); Abaelard. ep. 1 (M. 178, 127 C): non minus . . . obstupui quam si agnam teneram

famelico lupo committeret; Herodot. 4, 149 τοιγαρὼν ἔφη αὐτὸν καταλείψειν οἷν ἐν λύκοις; Diogen. 7, 62 προβάλλοντες κυσὶν ἄρνας.

LUPUS 9, p. 199. Alvar. Cordub. ep. 20 (M. 121, 513 A) atque, ut fabulae ferunt, lupum auribus retinens nec tenere potes, nec vales dimittere.

LUPUS 10, p. 199. Alcuin ep. 99 (M. 100, 310 A) passer aures habet apertas sed, ut video, proverbialis in fabula lupus gallo tulit vocem; Apost. 10, 89; see Tribukait, p. 26.

LUPUS 11. For discussion, see Tribukait, p. 26; Ioh. Sar. Polycrat. 1, 13 (M. 199, 412 A) cites and explains Verg. Ecl. 9, 53.

LUPUS 13. Hor. epod. 4, 1 lupis et agnis quanta sortito obtigit, | tecum mihi discordia est; Ovid ib. 43 pax erit haec nobis . . . | cum pecore infirmo quae solet esse lupis; Hom. Il. 22, 263 οὐδὲ λύκοι τε καὶ ἄρνες ὁμόφρονα θυμὸν ἔχουσιν; Diogen. 7, 63, πρὶν κε λύκος οἷν ποιμαῖνοι.

LUPUS 14. Lact. instit. 5, 3, 23 videlicet homo subdolos voluit lupum sub ovis pelle celare, ut fallaci titulo posset inretire lectorem; Hier. ep. 147, 11 sub vestitu ovium latebas lupus; ep. 22, 38 sub ovium pellibus lupos tegunt.

LUTUM 1, p. 201. Leo Magn. ep. 34 (M. 54, 802 B) si vero in eodem insipientiae suae luto iacere delegerit.

LUTUM 2, p. 201. Avit. Vienn. ep. 34, p. 184, 2 (Chev.) non se studuerunt de caeno, quo . . . tenentur, evolvere; Aesch. choeph. 697 ἔξω . . . πηλοῦ πόδα; see J. Koch, p. 33.

MORRIS C. SUTPHEN.

II.—ARISTOTLE'S DE ANIMA.¹

We may repeat of French Platonists and Aristotelians what Plato said of the Athenians—when they are good they are most excellent. Mr. Rodier's laborious edition of the *de Anima* not only supersedes but swallows and assimilates its German and English predecessors, Trendelenburg and Wallace. On every doubtful point he reproduces the opinions of all the ancient commentators, Alexander, Themistius, Simplicius, Philoponos, Sophonias, Priscianus, and the views of all moderns accessible through Zeller or Bursian's *Jahresbericht*. His own judicial summing up is almost always sane and right, and, where erroneous, can always be checked by the evidence which he supplies.

The constitution of the text is conservative. Mr. Rodier reprints with some interpolations of his own to bring it down to date the critical apparatus of Biehl in the Teubner text. He discusses with inexhaustible patience the emendations of Bonitz, Torstrik, Essen, Bywater, Christ, Kampe, Susemihl, Barco, Wilson, Freudenthal and others, but whenever they involve extensive alterations of the text or venturesome theories of double recensions or interpolation, he finally waves them aside. To minor corrections that seem to restore the sense by a change of punctuation or the altering of a letter or word, he is more favorable, and contributes a few such of his own suggestion. He has made a new collation of E without gleaning much. Following are the chief points of interest in his text:

403, b 17, he retains with E and Biehl the impossible *οὐτε ὡς χωριστά*. Cf. p. 152.

404, a 19, he deletes comma after *εἴρηται*, which he renders strangely 'on fait remarquer.'

404, b 10–11, he inserts commas before *ταύτας* and *ταύτην* to the improvement of the sense.

407, b 28, he retains in spite of Bernays *λόγους δ' ὥσπερ εὐθύνας δεδοκυία* which he tries to justify by the translation 'qui a déjà eu à fournir ses raisons pour ainsi dire en guise de châtement.'

¹ *Ἀριστοτέλους περὶ ψυχῆς*. 'Aristote Traité De L'Âme.' Traduit et Annoté par G. Rodier. Paris, Ernest Leroux, 1900.

409, b 20-24, he incloses *οἱ . . . σχεδόν* in parentheses and inserts a colon after *ἄλλων*.

410, a 29, he separates *καὶ πρὸς* by commas, translating 'en outre.' Cf. *infra* p. 153. The inserted footnote calling attention to this has got mixed with Biehl's note on Torstrik's emendation so as to make it appear that this punctuation and not Torstrik's reading rests on Sophonias.

412, a 16, he retains the perhaps unnecessarily explicit reading *ἐπεὶ δ' ἐστὶ σῶμα καὶ τοιονδὶ τοῦτο*.

417, b 6, he keeps *εἰς αὐτὸ* where *εἰς αὐτὸ* is better suited to the sense. In actualization the thing moves, if it can be said to move, to its (real) self. Mr. Rodier's 'en lui' can hardly be got out of his text.

426, a 27, he reads with Simplicius and Plutarch *εἰ δὲ συμφωνία φωνῇ τίς ἐστίν* for *εἰ δ' ἡ* and renders strangely 'comme une certaine espèce de voix est accord.' Cf. *infra*, p. 159.

427, a 10, he keeps with Biehl *ἢ μία ἢ δύο*, suggesting, however, *ἢ μία ἢ δύο* which, though harsh, gives the required sense.

428, a 24, *φανερόν τοίνυν ὅτι οὐδὲ δόξα μετ' αἰσθήσεως . . . φαντασία ἂν εἴη διὰ τε ταῦτα καὶ δῆλον ὅτι οὐκ ἄλλου τινός ἐστιν ἢ δόξα ἀλλ' ἐκείνου ἐστὶν οὐ καὶ ἡ αἰσθησις*. So Mr. Rodier prints, connecting *διὰ τε ταῦτα* with what precedes. The lack of any construction for *τε* seems to give him no concern, though he lightly remarks that we might read *γε*. Something is wrong. If one cared to emend, the whole could be smoothed out either by dropping *δῆλον* or reading *ὅτι δῆλον ὅτι*, and, though this is not indispensable, changing *ἐστίν* to *ἔσται*. Two reasons will then be alleged against the identification of *δόξα* and *αἰσθησις*, the foregoing *διὰ τε ταῦτα*, and also the fact that it involves the (intolerable) supposition that the object of *δόξα* and *αἰσθησις* is the same, which he proceeds to refute. Below, 428, b 8, Mr. Rodier retains the vexatious parenthesis *ἀλλὰ ψευδὴς ἐγίνετο, ὅτε λάθοι μεταπεσὸν τὸ πρᾶγμα* of which he gives precisely the explanation tentatively proposed at the end of Wallace's note, remarking at the same time that Wallace's corrections are unnecessary.

429, b 7, he accepts Bywater's excellent suggestion *δι' αὐτοῦ*.

429, b 13, cf. *infra*, p. 155.

430, b 17, in place of *ἀλλ' ἢ ἀδιαίρετα* he proposes and reads *ἀλλῃ ἀδιαίρετα*, which makes the sentence read smoothly, but leaves the connection with the following hopelessly obscure, a fact which he tries to disguise by a long explanatory parenthesis in the translation. The general meaning of Aristotle is plain enough, but the

wording is desperate and can be cured only by rewriting the passage.

430, b 25, he retains τῶν αἰτίων which Zeller (Aristotle, Trans. vol. II, p. 105) plausibly explains as a blundering dittography of ἐναντίον.

The not infrequent anacolutha of the *de Anima* and the hopeless passages which could be cured only by extensive changes, Mr. Rodier generally leaves, after discussion, translating them defiantly according to his final judgment of the general meaning.

The translation which accompanies the text is almost always right, and in precision and definiteness is, barring a few slips, a great improvement on Wallace. An extensive use of the bracket disfigures the page, but distinguishes most helpfully the literal version from the additions demanded by French idiom, or inserted to bring out the sequence of thought as conceived by Mr. Rodier. The following are the chief passages where he seems to have erred, or where at least difference of opinion is permissible: 402, b 8, ὁμοίως δὲ κἂν εἴ τι κοινὸν ἄλλο κατηγοροῖτο—'et de même tout autre attribut commun que l'on pourrait en affirmer.' *En* is misleading. The question, as Alexander rightly takes it, relates to any predicate that is used as a general term, not merely to any other general predicate of ζῷον.

402, b 22, ἐπειδὴν γὰρ ἔχωμεν ἀποδιδόναι κατὰ τὴν φαντασίαν περὶ τῶν συμβεβηκότων, ἢ πάντων ἢ τῶν πλείστων, τότε καὶ περὶ τῆς οὐσίας ἔχομεν τι λέγειν κάλλιστα. Here κατὰ τὴν φαντασίαν does not mean 'd'une façon conforme à ce que l'expérience manifeste,' but simply 'in sensuous presentation.' Wallace's 'to the mind's eye' is substantially right, though it errs in implying that the presentation must be always representation. Κατὰ is probably used somewhat as in καθ' ἑαυτὸν (*apud animum*) ζητεῖν; or as in 427, b 23, κατὰ δὲ τὴν φαντασίαν ὡσαύτως ἔχομεν ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ θεώμενοι. Mr. Rodier argues that the logic requires his rendering. Aristotle, he thinks, could not mean to say that the essence can be inferred from the συμβεβηκότα. He means that the possibility of explaining (ἀποδιδόναι) the συμβεβηκότα καθ' αὐτὰ from the essence is an *a posteriori* confirmation that the essence has been correctly defined. Otherwise, too, the following γὰρ is pointless. This is hypercritical. The passage is one of many in which Aristotle states that the definition is often best approached through a survey of particulars. (Zeller, Eng. Trans. I. 172). This process is virtually if not strictly induction (Zeller, I. 269). The καὶ of τότε καὶ and the future ἔχομεν are inex-

plicable on Mr. Rodier's interpretation. The γὰρ that follows in πάσης γὰρ ἀποδείξεως ἀρχὴ τὸ τί ἐστίν did not trouble Simplicius (15. 9) and need not us. It loosely assigns the reason for the emphasis laid on κάλλιστα. The sequence is: (and it is important to define οὐσία well) *for the what is it* is the starting point of all proofs and (here we have Mr. Rodier's idea) definitions that are not accompanied by concrete knowledge of the accidents, are empty and verbal. There is no real difficulty in the unprecise use of ἀποδιδόναι (cf. 406, a 27), and we need not introduce the distinction between συμβεβηκότα and καθ' αὐτὰ συμβεβηκότα.

403, b 17, ἐλέγομεν δ' ὅτι τὰ πάθη τῆς ψυχῆς οὔτε ὡς χωριστὰ τῆς φυσικῆς ὕλης τῶν ζώων, ἢ δὴ τοιαῦθ' ὑπάρχει, θυμὸς καὶ φόβος, καὶ οὐχ ὥσπερ γραμμὴ καὶ ἐπίπεδον. It is a pity that Mr. Rodier follows Biehl's text here which drives him to a forced unnatural translation inconsistent with his punctuation. Οὔτε ὡς and καὶ οὐχ are impossible correlates here. Obviously we must read with the majority of MSS and editors οὐ χωριστὰ or ἀχώριστα. The meaning is that the πάθη, *qua* such; i. e. *qua*, e. g., θυμὸς and φόβος, are ἀχώριστα, inseparable, even in thought from their material embodiment, and not like the line which *qua* line is separable in thought from physical matter. This is the interpretation of Simplicius (whose reference of τοιαῦτα Mr. Rodier misunderstands), and of Themistius. It is easy, though not necessary, to read γε, instead of δὲ, with U and Simplicius.

404, b 21, εἰ δὲ καὶ ἄλλως: 'Platon dit aussi.' The name of Plato should not be mentioned in connection with these fooleries of Xenocrates except where Aristotle explicitly attributes them to him.—405, a 16 γυν: 'en conséquence'; rather: at any rate.—405, b 26, διὸ καὶ τοῖς ὀνόμασιν ἀκολουθοῦσιν. May not this mean not that they 'raisonnent d'après les noms,' but that they etymologize to suit their respective theories? The phrasing of Cratylus, 436, b, εἴ τις . . . ἀκολουθοῖ τοῖς ὀνόμασι seems against it, but the general tenor of the discussion in the Cratylus favors it, and διὸ καὶ is certainly clearer so. Their physical theories are no reason for their etymologizing, but do explain the particular etymologies in which they seek support for the respective doctrines.

406, b 2, ὥστε καὶ ἡ ψυχὴ μεταβάλλοι ἂν κατὰ τὸ σῶμα: in spite of the Greek commentators may this not mean 'within the body' rather than 'comme le corps'? This gives point to the following antithesis: (if it can move *in* the body) it would follow that it can also, καὶ, go forth from the body and return. The same thought

seems to be implied in the comparison on the next page with the quicksilver which the Daedalus of Philippos poured into his wooden Aphrodite.—407, b 1, εἰ δ' ἐστὶν ἡ κίνησις αὐτῆς μὴ οὐσία can not of course be construed 'si le mouvement est la negation de l'essence de l'âme,' but in loose writing 'if movement is *not* its essence' may be treated as the logical equivalent of Mr. Rodier's version.

409, a 21, εἰ μὲν οὖν εἰσὶν ἕτεραι αἱ ἐν τῷ σώματι μονάδες καὶ αἱ στιγμαί —'si en outre, l'on prétend que les unités [psychiques qui résident] dans le corps sont différentes des points,' etc., αἱ ἐν τῷ σώματι μονάδες are not the psychic unities but the spatial points, as Themistius clearly explains. It is much more credible that Aristotle should have used μονάδες and στιγμαί interchangeably as he appears to do throughout the passage, than that he should repeatedly employ ἐν τῷ σώματι in contrary senses.—410, a 29, καὶ πρὸς τὸ ὅμοιον μαρτυρεῖ τὸ νῦν λεχθέν. Mr. Rodier's solution of this *crux* is to place a comma after καὶ πρὸς which he renders 'en outre.' This is ingenious but very abrupt and harsh, though Mr. Rodier might have quoted Plato Repub. 559 A for a similar position of καὶ πρὸς. The note affirms that the expression προσματυρεῖν (sic) τινα is Greek in the sense 'témoigner avec quelqu'un.' One would like to see his authority.

411, a 18, καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ὁμοειδῆ τοῖς μορίοις εἶναι: 'que l'âme qui réside dans les parties est (dans chacune d'elles) de même nature.' Rather: that the soul (the general soul of the air, etc.) is homogeneous with its parts (as they are found in animals, etc.). See the explanation of Themistius who apparently claims to be the first to understand the passage: ταύτης τῆς λέξεως ὅτι μὴ κατεκράτησαν οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν.

411, a 19, ὁ μὲν ἀὴρ διασπώμενος is not 'l'air respiré,' but, as Wallace correctly renders, 'air when divided.'

412, b 15, νῦν δ' ἐστὶ πέλεκυς the interpretation of Simplicius followed by Mr. Rodier 'mais, en fait, la hache existe' seems to yield the more plausible sequence. But the natural construction of the Greek makes rather for that of Themistius and Alexander: 'but in point of fact it's only an axe'—not an organic body.—

414, b 25, διὸ γελοῖον ζητεῖν τὸν κοινὸν λόγον καὶ ἐπὶ τούτων καὶ ἐφ' ἐτέρων, ὅς οὐδενὸς ἔσται τῶν ὄντων ἴδιος λόγος οὐδὲ κατὰ τὸ οἰκείον καὶ τὸ ἄτομον εἶδος, ἀφέντας τὸν τοιοῦτον. The Greek commentators differ and the text will always be doubtful. But the general interpretation of Themistius and Pacius is surely right that Aristotle means: 'it is absurd to seek (any other) general definition of souls or triangles

if you reject the type of general definition that I have given of the soul—*τὸν τοιοῦτον*.' It is impossible to construe with Mr. Rodier *οὐδὲ κατὰ τὸ οἰκείον*, etc., 'et de ne pas s'attacher a ce qui appartient en propre et à l'espèce indivisible.' Mr. Rodier's argument that this phrase must point to *ὥστε καθ' ἕκαστον ζητητέον* below is not convincing. The intervening sentence, *παραπλησίως δ' ἔχει*, etc., opens a new aspect of the question.

424, b 13, *animés* is by inadvertence for *inanimés*.—425, a 15, *ὡν ἑκάστη αἰσθήσει αἰσθανόμεθα κατὰ συμβεβηκός*. Mr. Rodier rightly rejects Torstrik's *οὐ* before *κατὰ*, and follows the Greek commentators in understanding the words to express not Aristotle's opinion but a part of the objection. Below, *ταῦτα γὰρ πάντα κινήσει αἰσθανόμεθα*, he interprets *κινήσει* 'par le mouvement qu'elle provoque en nous.' This, the explanation of Themistius and Simplicius, yields the smoothest sequence of thought, but strains the arts of interpretation to carry through consistently. Mr. Rodier shows that the Greek commentators agree with him, and that Physics 211, a 12, cited by Trendelenburg is irrelevant. But when it comes to *τὸ δ' ἡρεμοῦν τῷ μὴ κινεῖσθαι* he inconsistently rejects the explanation of Philoponos that *τῷ μὴ κινεῖσθαι* means 'by the unaltered persistence of the subjective state', and, reverting to the view which he has just rejected for the passage as a whole, says, 'peut-être Aristote veut-il dire plus simplement que le repos est perçu comme privation du mouvement.' It is a difficult question. The unanimity of the Greek commentators counts heavily. And it is true that Aristotle does not elsewhere deduce all the common sensibles from motion. But there is no inconsistency in supposing *κίνησις* to be the *ratio cognoscendi* of concepts, some of which are ontologically prior to it. The view of the Greek commentators may be due to the attempt to find here an explicit proof of what Aristotle merely asserts below that our perception of the *κοινά* is not accidental. Certainly the natural construction of the Greek is to take *κίνησις* as meaning simply (perception of) motion.

425, b 12, sqq. The difficult passage on consciousness of perception is in the main rightly explained, Zeller's misinterpretation (Trans. 2. 69 n. 3) being silently corrected. Mr. Rodier perfunctorily repeats from Bonitz and Trendelenburg at 425, b 22, the reference to Charmides 168 DE, but does not seem to perceive the indebtedness of the entire passage to Plato. Its two leading thoughts are: (1) the paradox of a faculty exercised upon itself (Charmides 167 sqq.); (2) the psychological regress *ad infinitum*

Theaetet. 200 C). In one point this oversight affects the interpretation: ἡ εἰς ἄπειρον εἶσιν ἢ αὐτὴ τις ἔσται αὐτῆς is rendered, 'ou bien ce second sens devra se sentir elle-même.' And in the notes (p. 265) Mr. Rodier objects to Philoponos' ἄτοπον τὸ αὐτὴν εἶναι αἰσθῆσιν εἶναι on the ground that it is not a second ἄτοπον, but the real opinion of Aristotle. But the Charmides passage would have made him feel more fully the force of τις and the future ἔσται. It is an ἄτοπον that we should have to admit a faculty that perceives itself, but it is better to accept this ἄτοπον at the beginning of the series than later, since we can escape it only by an infinite regress.

427, b 17, Mr. Rodier's solution of the *εἴτις* ὅτι δ' οὐκ ἔστιν [ἡ] αὐτὴ νόησις καὶ ὑπόληψις is to bracket ἡ with Schneider and render 'qu'elle (sc. φαντασία) ne soit ni la pensée ni la croyance.' This is impossible. The one thing certain is that Aristotle here means to distinguish φαντασία from ὑπόληψις. We have the choice of dropping νόησις and inserting φαντασία from the margin of U, or of taking νόησις as a loose synonym of φαντασία. The latter is by no means impossible. For ὑπόληψις here is not, as often, used of the higher intellect generally, but of belief as opposed to mere presentation. Now, much as φαντασία and νόησις differ for other purposes, for this argument they are alike, in that both are mere representations which, unlike belief, can be summoned up at will. It is thus careless writing to substitute νόησις for φαντασία, but not too careless for Aristotle perhaps. But it is incredible that νόησις and ὑπόληψις should be virtually identified in opposition to φαντασία in a passage which emphasizes the aspect of ὑπόληψις that is antithetic to φαντασία and νόησις alike. It is no objection that later φαντασία in another sense is treated as a state that admits both truth and error.

429, b 13, τὸ σαρκὶ εἶναι καὶ σάρκα καὶ ἡ ἄλλῃ ἢ ἄλλως ἔχοντι κρίνει. Mr. Rodier follows Biehl in retaining καὶ, the impossibility of which he vainly disguises by the rendering 'c'est aussi par des facultés différentes.' In what follows he assumes that Aristotle is speaking of three things: (1) sense to judge sensibles; (2) intellect in one attitude for concepts involving matter; (3) intellect otherwise modified for pure concepts. But Aristotle has not yet decided, if he ever does decide, that the pure intellect is separable. The alternative of ἄλλῃ and ἄλλως ἔχοντι, then, applies to the cognition of sensibles and intelligibles as well as to the two kinds of intelligibles. We have not three choices, but two repeated in two planes. Zeller (Trans. 2. 93) has shown that there is no

objection to speaking of *νοῦς* as in a certain sense apprehending αἰσθητά.

429, b 29, ἡ τὸ μὲν πάσχειν κατὰ κοινόν τι διήρηται πρότερον, ὅτι δυνάμει πῶς ἐστὶ τὰ νοητά ὁ νοῦς, etc.—'que nous avons distingué plus haut la passion qui s'exerce grâce à une communauté [entre l'agent et le patient de celle qu'on peut attribuer à l'intellect.]' This perhaps roughly gives the sense for practical purposes, but διήρηται can hardly be so used of distinguishing one thing from another. Render rather: or have we distinguished two senses of πάσχειν κατὰ κοινόν τι, etc. The reference is to 417, b 1-17. Here instead of explicitly naming the two senses: (1) the proper sense; (2) the passage from δύναμις to ἐνέργεια, he merely reminds us that the πάσχειν of νοῦς in relation to νοητά falls under the second head in that the νοῦς is potentially the νοητά. This is virtually the interpretation of Brentano, that of Simplicius which Mr. Rodier supposes to be different, and of Themistius. For the κοινόν τι cf. 405, b 20, and 433, a 22.—431, b 8, καὶ ὅταν εἴπῃ ὡς ἐκεῖ τὸ ἡδὺ ἢ λυπηρόν, ἐνταῦθα φεύγει ἢ διώκει—'et lorsqu'il a prononcé que là est l'agréable,' etc. This is a very forced and un-Aristotelian construction of the Greek. ὡς ἐκεῖ, as Simplicius takes it, plainly means 'as there,' in the field of sense perception, as contrasted with ἐνταῦθα, where thought is dealing with representative images. In view of Aristotle's elliptic style, Torstrik's addition of τὸ ἀγαθὸν ἢ κακόν after ἐνταῦθα is unnecessary though it gives the sense.—432, b 4, καὶ ἄτοπον δὲ τὸ τοῦτο διασπᾶν does not mean 'de séparer . . . des autres,' but 'to split up, divide up.'—435, b 12, ἀ τῇ ἀφῇ φθείρει, not 'qui seraient pernicieuses pour le toucher,' 'but which destroy by contact.'

The purpose of the commentary is to elucidate Aristotle's meaning and justify the translation, sentence by sentence. Its two chief features are the extensive illustration of Aristotle's terminology and the full presentation of the views of other commentators, ancient and modern. In the first respect Mr. Rodier, like the generality of modern interpreters, has been tempted by the convenience of Bonitz' index into an excess of merely lexicographical illustration, where a brief reference to Zeller or Bonitz would have sufficed. The citations from the Greek commentators are interesting and helpful, especially those from Alexander and Themistius, who were very sensible, intelligent fellows. But one grudges the space assigned to the moderns, and regrets that Mr. Rodier could not have devoted to the discussion of the

philosophic problems involved in his text, some of the pages wasted in rejecting with sad civility the wanton emendations of Torstrik, for example. It is true Mr. Rodier explicitly disavows the purpose of dealing with the larger philosophic problems of the book, but in a commentary of nearly six hundred pages on a philosophical text there should surely be some room for philosophy. The *de Anima* is a treatise on psychology. Its difficulties are by no means exclusively philological, caused by the uncertainty of the text, the loss of much contemporary literature, the peculiarities of Aristotle's terminology, the exasperating carelessness of his style. They are due quite as much to the fact that Aristotle did not and could not know his own mind—that he was struggling with problems that have not yet been solved, and to which he was precluded from giving a coherent answer by the fundamental inconsistency that runs through his entire system. The purely empiric conception of knowledge and the origin of general ideas employed in the *Organon* and as a basis for the polemic against Plato was from the start hopelessly irreconcilable with the transcendental presuppositions that were to find their ultimate expression in the doctrine of a definition that expresses the metaphysical unity of essence, of forms somehow separable from matter, of energy divorced from all taint of potentiality, of an agent that does not touch, though the patient is touched, of a motor that does not move, of a passive intellect that is the mere potentiality of thought, and yet is neither sense nor imagination, of an active reason that thinks always in pure forms and yet operates to actualize the passive reason of a finite mind inseparable from the bodily organism. Again and again as Aristotle finds himself on the verge of this gulf of inconsistencies he shies off violently, postpones his decision, and resumes the interminable discussion of *ἀπορίαι*. This is probably the reason why he never completed his system in the direction to which all the lines inevitably converge by distinctly identifying the *νοῦς ποιητικός* with the divine mind regarded as the abode and sum of all Platonic ideas. Mr. Rodier, like Zeller, admits in general terms the rift of inconsistency that runs through the Aristotelian philosophy.¹ But, like Zeller, he is apt to deal with each particular passage as if it were unaffected by this fundamental fact. In each case he is so bent upon smoothing away difficulties and showing the essential reasonableness of the Aristotelian standpoint that he often

¹ See Preface, and the note on the *νοῦς* problem, pp. 28–30.

leaves the impression that there is no final insoluble residuum of inconsistency and confusion. This is notably the case in his remarks on the reality of the general notion (pp. 18-19), on the problem of the unity of the definition (177, 475), on the identity of a thing and its *τί ἦν εἶναι*,¹ on the reconciliation of the doctrine of a separable soul with the dependence of thought upon imagination (453), on the relation of the *νοῦς ποιητικός* to God and the Platonic ideas. In these and many other cases the only adequate commentary would be one that related Aristotle to Plato on the one hand, and to modern psychology on the other. The explicit references to Plato, as e. g. that to the *ψυχογονία*, are amply illustrated by Mr. Rodier. A few examples of less obvious connections of thought may be given here. The discussion of the relation of matter and form in the definition in 403, b, and 412, should be illustrated by Cratylus 389, which is the chief source of this important Aristotelian idea, as will appear also by a comparison of *de part. an.* 640 b. The entire substance of the doctrine is already in Plato—the determination of the essence by the function or use, the equivocal use of form to denote both logical essence and physical shape, the necessity that such a form or essence should find its embodiment in a particular and appropriate matter.—In 405, a 4, *τά τε γὰρ κινητικὸν τὴν φύσιν τῶν πρώτων ὑπελήφασιν, οὐκ ἀλόγως. ὅθεν ἔδοξε τισι πῦρ εἶναι* probably refers to the discussion in *Leges* 892, and particularly to the words (892 C), *φύσιν βούλονται λέγειν γένεσιν τὴν περὶ τὰ πρῶτα. εἰ δὲ φανήσεται ψυχή πρῶτον οὐ πῦρ*, etc. In 409, b 31, *ἀλλὰ τὸ σύνολον τίτι γνωριεῖ ἢ αἰσθήσεται*; the thought that knowledge of the elements of a thing will not by simple mechanical addition yield knowledge of the composite whole goes back to the discussion of the syllable and its *στοιχεῖα* in *Theaetet.* 203 sqq. This passage made a strong impression upon Aristotle as appears from many veiled and some explicit allusions in his writings: e. g. *Met.* 1043, b 5, *οὐ φαίνεται δὴ ζητοῦσιν ἢ συλλαβὴ ἐκ τῶν στοιχείων οὕσα καὶ συνθέσεως*. The whole is more than the sum of its parts in the case of qualities or psychological states. As Professor James says (*Psychology* 1. 160), "There would be a hundred and first feeling then, if when a group or series were set a consciousness belonging to the group as such should emerge."—The statement in 414, b 20, that a general definition of soul is as void as a general definition of *σχῆμα*

¹ P. 443, in citing *Met.* 1032, a 8, *καὶ εἰ ταὐτὸ Σωκράτης καὶ Σωκράτει εἶναι*, he omits *καὶ εἰ*!

was probably suggested by Meno 74 E, *τί ἐστι τοῦτο . . ὃ δὴ ὀνομά-
ξεις σχῆμα καὶ οὐδὲν μᾶλλον φῆς τὸ στρογγύλον σχῆμα εἶναι ἢ τὸ εὐθύ.*—In
415, a 29, the idea that generation is a striving of the mortal to
put on immortality *ἵνα τοῦ ἀεὶ καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ μετέχωσιν ἢ δύνανται* needs
illustration from its source, Symp. 207 D, 208 B. In 418, a 20,
and 425, a 26, the apparent reversal of the normal use of *κατὰ συμ-
βεβηκός* by which a substance is made the accident of a distantly
perceived quality, *τούτῳ δὲ συμβέβηκεν νῖφ Κλέωνος εἶναι*, was probably
suggested by the psychological analysis in Philebus 38 D of the
errors that arise in the perception of a distant object.—In 418,
a 30, the peculiar use of *καθ' αὐτό*, not in its logical sense, but of
an object the color of which belongs to it, is probably to be traced
in the last resort to the discussion in Lysis 217 CD of the cases in
which the *παρουσία* of the color does or does not imply real color-
ing. Cf. *καθὸ* in Met. 1022, a 15–18, and *καθ' αὐτό ὡς ἐπιφάνεια
λευκόν* in Met. 1029, b 17.—In 420, b 19, the distinction between
the *ἀναγκαῖον* of taste and the *εὖ* of speech comes from Timaeus 75 E.

In the difficult passage 426, b 3, sqq. a reference to the Philebus
is needed, not merely for illustration, but to give the true mean-
ing. Aristotle apparently argues that *αἴσθησις* is a proportion or
ratio (*λόγος*) for the reason (1) that certain forms of sensation are
evidently so as e. g. the sensation of a *συμφωνία*, and (2) because
excess destroys the sensation. He adds, speaking of various
qualities of sight, smell and taste: *διὸ καὶ ἡδέα μὲν ὅταν εἰλικρινῇ καὶ
ἀμυγῇ ὄντα αἴγεται εἰς τὸν λόγον, οἷον τὸ ὀξύ ἢ γλυκὺ ἢ ἀλμυρόν, ἡδέα γὰρ
τότε ὅλως δὲ μᾶλλον τὸ μικτόν συμφωνία ἢ τὸ ὀξύ ἢ τὸ βαρύν. ἀφῇ δὲ τὸ
θερμαντὸν ἢ ψυκτόν. ἢ δ' αἴσθησις ὁ λόγος. ὑπερβάλλοντα δὲ λυπεῖ ἢ
φθείρει.* I do not think that certainty is attainable with regard to
the last three lines. But the general meaning of the passage, and
the special force of *ἡδέα μὲν* which has been generally misunder-
stood appear only by comparison with Philebus 51 C–53 B.
There Plato argues that there is a natural pleasure attached to
pure unmixed sensations of tone, color, and the like, employing
the terms *καθαρόν*, *εἰλικρινές*, etc. As compared with these he dis-
parages 'mixed' sensations, purposely perhaps confounding the
mixture of pleasure and pain with the mixture of different qualities
of sense. Alluding to this Aristotle says: 'the sensations are, it
is true (*μὲν* concessive), pleasurable when they are presented
εἰλικρινῇ καὶ ἀμυγῇ to the sense which being itself a *λόγος* perceives
and judges their purity; but in general *ὅλως δὲ* there is more
pleasure in a harmoniously mixed sensation, the ratios and pro-

portions of which are perceived by sense as it perceives a συμφωνία. The correlate of ἡδία μὲν is ὅλως δὲ not ὑπερβάλλοντα δὲ as Mr. Rodier seems to say, p. 377. ἀγεται εἰς τὸν λόγον means 'are presented to the sense' (which is a λόγος), not 'elles sont amenées à s'unir dans la proportion voulue.' Wallace so far misapprehends the thought that he actually cites to prove that ἀλμυρόν is a mixture, a passage (Meteorolog. 358-9) in which Aristotle says that the salt taste of sea water is due to an intermixture of solid particles with the water. It is idle to dogmatize about the last three lines. The sentence begins as if Aristotle meant to say: 'but generally speaking the mixed is more pleasurable.' συμφωνία may be an interpolation, or we may read something like εἰ συμφωνία or ἐν συμφωνίᾳ ὅν or ὥσπερ συμφωνία. The words ἢ τὸ ὀξύ ἢ τὸ βαρύ may mean than the (unmixed) acute or grave, or possibly, which better suits the required sense, they and the following τὸ θερμαντὸν ἢ ψυκτὸν may be loosely appended alternative examples of the constituents of pleasurable mixtures. In any case the key to the whole is (1) the Philebus passage; (2) the idea that sense is a kind of λόγος, both in the pleasurable perception of the purity of pure qualities, and, despite Plato, in the still more pleasurable perception of the proportions of a harmonious blend.—In 428, a 12, the, to a modern, surprising statement αἱ δὲ φαντασίαι γίνονται αἱ πλείους ψευδεῖς is due to a reminiscence of Philebus 40 AB, where φαντάσματα is used of imaginative pictures of hope and desire, and it is added that for the wicked such pictures are generally false, i. e. not destined to be realized.

Many other minor illustrations might be drawn from the psychological parts of the Philebus, Theaetetus, Phaedo, Republic, Sophist and Timaeus. But I prefer to give the space that remains to a typical ἀπορία that originating in certain passages of the Parmenides and Charmides¹ runs all through the *de Anima*. It is the ever-recurring metaphysical problem of devising any theory of communication between matter and a totally disparate mind, that does not break down the distinction between them.

The first hint of it appears in the criticism of Anaxagoras' νοῦς ἀμυγής 405, b 22. It is employed somewhat sophistically in the polemic against the psychology of the world soul of the Timaeus interpreted with matter of fact literalness 407, a 10-12. In 409, b 5, it is invoked against the theory that the soul is a monad or a point. If such points are identical with those of the body all

¹ Parmen. 132 C, Charm. 167-8.

bodies must possess souls. In 410, a 16-18, it is again touched upon in the discussion of the general theory that the soul is made up of the elements of things. It is repeated again against Empedocles in 410, b 8, and lurks in the objection that his god, the Sphaeros, will be more ignorant than the finite beings that are acquainted with strife, an objection which, as Mr. Rodier observes, applies with equal force to Aristotle's God, and which, he does not observe, was suggested by the Parmenides. [134 D 'Αρ' οὐν οἷός τε αὐτὸς ἔσται ὁ θεὸς τὰ παρ' ἡμῖν γιγνώσκων;] It reappears 425, b 19, in the question whether if there is a sense that sees (is conscious of) sight, sight itself must not be colored, and in the problem, 427 a, of how unity can be aware of multiplicity and difference. Lastly, it culminates in the ἀπορία of 429, b 26 sqq., where Aristotle raises the question, what is the relation of νοῦς conceived as itself intelligible (νοητός) to things, to *cognita*. If it is νοητός solely in virtue of being νοῦς, then all νοητά must possess νοῦς. If it is νοητός in virtue of some other quality which it possesses in common with other νοητά, then it is no longer "gesondert ungemischt und nur sich selber gleich." His solution is that *cognita* and νοητά are of two kinds: (1) pure forms in the case of which thought and its object coincide and the question disappears; (2) forms immersed in matter. In the latter the νοητόν has only a potential existence before the realizing activity of νοῦς, and such a potential νοητόν does not involve the presence of νοῦς. Thought, therefore, may be an intelligible, though all intelligibles need not possess thought.

This purely verbal evasion Mr. Rodier seems to accept as satisfactory and requiring no further comment. But the problem, as we have seen, has a history, and Aristotle's failure to solve it has a reason. It is substantially identical with and was probably suggested by the cavil against the Platonic ideas put in the mouth of Parmenides. 132 C, οὐκ ἀνάγκη, εἰ τὰλλα φησὶ τῶν εἰδῶν μετέχειν, ἢ δοκεῖν σοὶ ἐκ νοημάτων ἕκαστον εἶναι καὶ πάντα νοεῖν, ἢ νοήματα ὄντα ἀνόητα εἶναι; On the surface this is a mere sophistical quibble, but it distinctly raises the epistemological problem of the Aristotelian passage. Aristotle's pure forms, whether he knows it or not, are Platonic ideas, and he has the further embarrassment that they are not like the Platonic ideas, all-inclusive, but leave outside their circle an indeterminate and inexplicable residuum of forms or ideas more or less universal in matter, the psychological and ontological status of which his system was unable to define. If thought

is conceived in pure isolation and qualitative distinction from 'things,' how can it in any way apprehend them? And if there is a qualitative likeness or partial identity, then must not all things think in some degree, and is not the absolute barrier broken down? Monistic, hylozoistic, pantheistic philosophies frankly accept the second alternative. They boldly affirm with Diogenes of Apollonia that the air thinks, with Parmenides that the corpse is aware of darkness and silence, with Empedocles that all things have a part in knowledge and perception, with Shelley that 'every grain is sentient.' This is repugnant to common sense. But philosophers who appeal to common sense find the line very hard to draw. Wundt and Riehl, for example, in our own day, after accepting the parallelism of the two aspect theory for the relation of mind and body, extend it to animals, then in a sense to plants, and so are finally confronted with the question whether there may not be a subjective 'side' to every atom. Aristotle, always a champion of common sense, could not entertain such a thought. Yet his incoherent system provided him with no real defense against it. The Platonic ideas banished in the *Organon* were returning in the shape of a dimly conceived, active, intellect or divine mind, identical with its own thoughts. The only consistent issue would have been to make these thoughts include all general notions, the abstract reflection or duplication of everything, and to make the divine mind immanent in the universe. Just as Plato rejected the notion that there was anything too lowly to have an idea, so Aristotle was logically bound to admit that the most trivial reality or transient relation was capable of verbal formulation, and consequently of intelligible conception as mere essence and *τί ἦν εἶναι*. And on this view the divine mind identical with its own thoughts would be thinking in everything. I attribute no such doctrine to Aristotle. I am merely showing that the distinctions by which he sought to evade it were either purely verbal or implied a psychology which he would not accept and could not consistently apply. He undoubtedly endeavored to limit the pure ideas or essences by a theory akin to Mill's doctrine of 'natural kinds.' He would admit logical essence, *τί ἦν εἶναι*, and definition in the strict sense only of natural species or (for on this point neither he nor his disciples have ever been clear), of the individuals belonging to them. But this limitation inevitably breaks down. Events, as eclipses, e. g. are more significant for the theory of the definition than the things of

natural kinds. Abstract nouns expressive of relations and qualities are for many purposes quite as pure ideas as those that express the essence of a species. To say that they are *εὐθὺς ὅπερ ὃν τι* is a mere evasion of the final question as to their ontological status. So of the distinction between pure forms and those that involve matter. The real and the verbal classification constantly cross one another. It is a mere accident of language that in *σιμός* the implication of a particular matter is thrust upon the attention more prominently than in *κοῖλος* or *καμπυλότης*. But if, as Aristotle repeatedly says, the mind can never think *ἀνευ φαντάσματος*, the implication of the matter is always present. And as a matter of fact Aristotle was never able to specify the ideas that can be thought as pure form, or to determine the content of the divine, self-thinking thought. If the divine mind could only think 'natural kinds' its range of knowledge would be far more limited than that of the Empedoclean god which Aristotle censured on this score. And if the *νοῦς ποιητικός* could think only 'natural kinds' how on Aristotelian principles could it actualize in the passive mind the potentiality of thinking all other abstractions? There is no escape on these lines from a reinstatement of all Platonic ideas in a universal and immanent mind.

Even if we waive all this, the second half of Aristotle's explanation brings back the puzzle in another form. Ideas involving matter have only a potential existence in the material things, he says. This is absolutely satisfactory to common sense, but the convenient evasion 'potentially' will not bear analysis. The problem is: if thought thinks all things must it not be in some sense coextensive with all things? No, replies Aristotle, for the *abstracta* (the Forms) of mere qualities and mathematical relations (as distinguished from essences proper) do not dwell in the material object except potentially. It is the active mind that educes them and makes them actual. But waiving the point already made that the active mind can not actualize thoughts which by hypothesis it does not itself think, we still ask how is the contact effected. 'The stone is not in the soul' (*οὐ γὰρ ὁ λίθος ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ*). Neither is the *νοῦς* in the stone. If the *νοῦς* enters the stone, or the stone, in Platonic phrase, *μετέχει*, participates in the *νοῦς*; why does not the stone think? If, on the other hand, the stone, or the Form of the stone, finds its way into the mind by the psychological process described in *Analytica Posteriora* II 15, then we have the purely sensualistic psychology which Hobbes

learned from Aristotle, 'physics becomes first philosophy,' all talk of a separable *νοῦς*, of pure forms, and of an 'active mind' becomes meaningless, and the alternative before us is as in modern times materialism or some form of Berkeleian idealism. 'Potential' is a good word to conjure with, but it explains nothing, as Aristotle himself sometimes appears to be uneasily aware. And it is time that the historians of Greek philosophy abandoned the habit of breaking Plato's metaphors on the logical wheel, while at the same time they allow 'common sense' to select a plausible body of Aristotelian doctrine from two inconsistent and irreconcilable psychologies.

However metaphysical and remote from the solid ground of philological method such considerations may appear, they are indispensable to the interpretation of either Plato or Aristotle. And we cannot escape them by Sprachstatistik, collation of manuscripts, or respectful discussion of the emendations of Torstrik.

PAUL SHOREY.

III.—SOME IRREGULAR FORMS OF THE ELEGIAC DISTICH.

The elegiac distich consists, in its regular form, of four dactylic cola; two tripodies, uniting in the usual way to form an hexameter, followed by two catalectic tripodies uniting, according to rules of their own, to form the so-called pentameter.¹ The independence of the elegiac hexameter is clearly indicated by hiatus and syllaba anceps.² Exceptions are very rare. Gleditsch, l. c., quotes Simonides, 120 (Cr.) for the division of a word between the two lines of the distich. The word, however, is a proper name, the epigram an *ἀνάθημα* and bracketed by Crusius.³ At any rate this license must have been as uncommon as the same thing in ottava rima.⁴

In the pentameter, both Latin and Greek, the rule that the two dactyls of the second hemistich must be kept pure is practically unbroken. Exceptions to the rule of diaeresis between the two hemistichs are also very rare. Hephaistion, p. 53, W., quotes:

Ἰερά, νῦν δὲ Διοσκουρίδew γενηί (Kallim. 192, Schn.)

It will be observed that the word here is a compound proper name and that the pause occurs between the parts⁵. Euripides,

¹ Everyone now is aware that "pentameter" is a misnomer. The verse has six feet, not five. The word, however, is not only convenient but was a common designation of it as early as Hermesianax. See Athenaeus XIII, 598, A and Weil, *JJ*, 1865, p. 655. But see G. Schultz, *Hermes* 35, pp. 308 ff.

² See Christ, *Metrik der Griechen und Römer*, par. 245 and ref., H. Gleditsch, par. 38 (*Müller's Handb.*, vol. II), Rossbach and Westphal³, III 2, p. 80.

³ Two other cases are quoted by Rossbach, l. c.

⁴ Ariosto 41, 32, 1-2; 43, 105, 3-4, both compound words, are the only cases in the *Orl. Furioso* (4832 stanzas). 42, 14, 3 should not be included since the device is meant to represent the last word (a compound proper name) of Brandimarte cut short by death. No cases occur in Boiardo or in Tasso's *Ger. Lib.* The effect of this device in English is comic. Comp. Canning's famous song, "Eleven Years in Prison," and Saxe's "Rhyme of the Rail."

⁵ Christ, 244, cites another verse from Mar. Victorinus, 2561. But comp. the remarks of Victorinus himself and the text of Schneider, Kallim. *Frag.* Anon. 392, Hiller-Cr., *Frag. eleg. adesp.* 13, and Bergk, *Frag. adesp.* 13.

Kyklops, 74, generally quoted by writers on metric, is without this excuse. But I shall discuss the line later.

Even elision between the two hemistichs of the pentameter, which is not especially infrequent in Greek, is very rare in Latin.

But, on the other hand, the unity of the pentameter, the strict conception of it as a single verse, is emphasized, in Latin, by the avoidance of hiatus between hemistichs and, in both Latin and Greek, by the avoidance of a short syllable at the end of the first hemistich.¹

It is a commonplace of criticism that the distich is capable of reproducing practically every tone and semi-tone in the gamut of human feeling. The truth of Schiller's famous description has been strenuously attacked but, at all events, the pentameter stands for the emotional side of the combination. In these brief hemistichs and, particularly, in the abrupt medial catalexis the imaginative reader may perhaps be pardoned for finding, by turns, the pause which points the preacher's moral or precedes the sting of the epigram, the sob which chokes the song of the bereaved, the cry to arms, the hiccup that tells of dining not wisely, the incoherence of the happy lover or, again, the sigh of one who knows too well that to him neither youth nor beauty nor happy love shall ever come again.

So it came to pass that the distich was found equally suitable whether wrought to the temper and genius of Archilochos, the war-songs of Kallinos and Tyrtaios, the laments of Mimnermos, the politics and moral saws of Solon and Theognis, or the literary epigrams of Simonides and the long line of his distinguished successors. Euripides, *Androm.* 103 f. appears to anticipate the Alexandrian elegists in their return to the old Ionian type of Mimnermos. I find no other cases in the drama. With the Alexandrians the use of the distich was varied and extensive. Through them it reached the Romans. Here it was perfected for the epigram by Catullus and Martial, and for the elegy by Gallus, Tibullus, Propertius and Ovid.

During the last twenty or thirty years much minute and searching study has been devoted to the technical art of the elegiac distich in its regular form, and we are gradually being lifted to a

¹It was held by some metricians under the Empire that—in accord with their theory of origins—this syllable might be short. But even in later times we find few traces of its occurrence. See Christ, p. 207; Rossbach, l. c., p. 81.

more intelligent conception of the grace and delicacy as well as the versatility and power of a form which, with the single exception of the hexameter itself, may claim to be at once the most artistic, the oldest, the most widely used, and the longest to live, of all the metrical forms of classical antiquity.

When one considers the long life and popularity of the distich as well as the variety of talent still represented in what remains of it, the permanence of the regular form is remarkable. Radical deviations are rare, although a complete survey of literature and inscriptions for a dozen or more centuries reveals a number large enough to deserve more attention than hitherto seems to have been given them. Christ and Roszbach, in their excellent works, have devoted as much attention to them as could be expected in practical hand-books. Usener, in his thoughtful and convincing *Altgriechischer Versbau* has pointed out and explained the importance of some of these deviations on the side of metre in its historical development. Otherwise I find very little reference to the subject besides an editorial comment here and there, which usually begins and ends with the mere citation of a parallel or two and the observation that such forms are characteristic of uneducated people. That the ancient metricians did nothing with the subject is not surprising. Their purpose was to describe not so much how the distich had been written as how it should be written. Hence their chief concern was the normal type as presented by the great masters.¹

While accepting in full the views of Usener regarding the ultimate origin of these forms it has seemed to me that some of them deserve a more detailed examination of their sphere and character. They betray, if not an artistic, at least a conscious, theory of composition that should partly account for their survival to the latest times. Moreover, it is certain that, in some cases, their authors are beyond the suspicion of either ignorance or inability.²

¹ See Roszbach, l. c., p. 81, for references to the ancient metricians on this subject.

The preliminary collection of material, which would otherwise be very tedious, is much simplified by the fact that not only certain bulky departments, like the epic, may be passed over at once, but that the vast field of inscriptions has already been gleaned for all poetical forms by Kaibel, *Carmina ex lapidibus collecta*, etc., 1878, and by Buecheler, *Carmina Epigraphica*, 1898. See also F. D. Allen, *Papers of the Amer. School at Athens*, IV (1888),

I.

Those cases in which the pentameter occurs outside of the distich and is not associated with the hexameter. These may be classed as:

A. The use of the pentameter with verses other than the hexameter.

B. The use of the pentameter as a monostich.

C. The use of the pentameter *κατὰ στίχον*.

A. The pentameter with verses other than the hexameter.

Under this head the most noteworthy examples are the "dramatic pentameters" mentioned by Christ, p. 211, Gleditsch, p. 718, and others. A rapid survey of the Greek drama, including the fragments found in the editions of Koch, Kaibel and Nauck, reveals the following cases. For purposes of discussion, I quote them in full:

Aischylos, *Suppl.* 541-2,

οἷστρω ἐρεσσομένα
φείγεται ἀμαρτίνοος

= 550-1,

Λύδία τ' <ἀγ> γάλα
καὶ δὲ ὀρώων Κελίκων

Agam. 1005,

καὶ πόντος εὐθυπορῶν
(second half lost)

= 1022-3,

οὐδὲ τὸν ὀρθοδαῖ
τῶν φθιμένων ἀνάγειν

Choeph. 380-1,

τοῦτο διαμπερές οὐς
ἴκεθ' ἅπερ τι βέλος,

p. 37. For Greek literature we have Bergk's *Poetae Lyrici Graeci*⁴, to which should be added the later *Editio Minor* by Crusius, Leipzig, 1897, and Preger's *Inscriptiones Graecae Metricae ex Scriptoribus praeter Anthologiam collectae*, Leipzig, 1891. Müller's *De Re Metrica* contains a tolerably complete survey of Latin literature from this point of view. In addition I have made a rapid examination, on the one side, to Gregory Nazianzen, on the other, to Boethius, inclusive, of those authors in whom such forms were at all likely to occur. My collection cannot claim to be exhaustive. It seems sufficient, however, for the purpose of this investigation.

= 394-5,

καὶ πότ' ἂν ἀμφιθαλῆς
Ζεὺς ἐπὶ χεῖρα βάλοι;

Eumenid. 962-3,

ματροκασιγνήται,
δαίμονες ὀρθονόμοι,

= 982-3,

ἀντιφόνους ἄτας
ἄρπαλίσαι πόλεως

Euripides, I. T. 1235-6,

ὅν ποτε Δηλιάσιν
καρποφόροις γνάλοις

= 1260-1,

παῖδ' ἀπενάσσαστο Λα-
τῶς ἀπὸ ζαθέων¹

Rhesos, 245-6,

λήματος· ἥ σπανία
τῶν ἀγαθῶν ὅταν ᾖ

= 256-7,

μῖμον ἔχων ἐπὶ γᾶν
θηρὸς; ἔλοι Μενέλαν

Troades, 822-3,

Λαομεδόντιε παῖ,
Ζανὸς ἔχεις κυλίκων

= 842-3,

οὐρανίδαισι μέλων
ὥς τότε μὲν μεγάλως

Kyklops, 74,

ὦ φίλος, ὦ φίλε Βακχεῖε, ποῖ οἰοπολεῖς;

Orestes, 1436,

φάρεα πορφύρεα, δῶρα Κλυταιμνήστρα

Helena, 1479-80 (quoted by Christ, l. c.),

γενοίμεθα Λίβνες (corrupt)
οἰωνοὶ στολάδες

= 1496-7,

δι' αἰθέρος ἰέμενοι
παῖδες Τυνδαρίδαι²

¹ But see Bruhn's critical note on these lines.

² I have omitted Eurip. *Suppl.* 280, quoted by Christ, l. c. The text is very troublesome. See Wecklein's critical note and appendix.

Aristoph., *Nubes*, 1158,

οἷος ἐμοὶ τρέφεται
τοῖσδ' ἐνὶ δώμασι παῖς

It will be observed that in eight of these nineteen cases strophe corresponds to antistrophe in the usual way, hence, we really have but eleven to consider.

A comparison of these "dramatic pentameters" with the average elegiac pentameter reveals differences that, it seems to me, are sufficiently marked to render a change in terminology desirable. For example:

In the first hemistich of the elegiac pentameter the general rule is that either or both of the dactyls may be replaced by spondees. It may be added, however, that, in a large majority of cases, one of the dactyls *is* replaced by a spondee. This is especially true of the Roman poets, as might be expected, but, with varying strictness, the rule applies to the distich throughout its entire history. Of course, the reason for it is plain enough. In this connection I examined the Greek distich previous to and contemporary with the drama, obviously the only period of its history to be considered, and found that only about twenty per cent. of the pentameters—one case in five—had two pure dactyls in the first hemistich.

If now we turn to our dramatic examples we find that no less than ten of the eleven cases keep two dactyls in the first hemistich. Now, of course, the question of monotony does not have to be taken into consideration here. These 'dramatic pentameters' always occur alone and are very rare, whereas the regular elegiac pentameter recurs every second verse as long as the poem goes on. But after all possible allowances are made this explanation still seems insufficient to account for a difference so marked.

And this is not all. Turning to Euripides, *Orestes*, 1436 and *Helena*, 1479 = 1496 (quoted by Christ) we find that the rigid and universal rule of pure dactyls in the second hemistich is not observed.

Thirdly, we may consider the quantity of the last syllable in the first hemistich. We have already seen¹ that under the Empire it was held by some metricians that this syllable might be either long or short. But previous to that time, indeed, by the best authors, as a rule, of that period, this syllable is kept

¹See p. 166, note 1,

long. This rule of the elegiac pentameter is very rarely broken. Christ, p. 207, notes Theognis 2, 440, 478, 1066 and 1232. These are all in one author, and I observed no other cases in the pre-dramatic distich (about 1200 pentameters). But no less than two of our nineteen¹ 'dramatic pentameters,' Aisch., *Suppl.* 550, and Eurip., *Orestes* 1436, exhibit the exceptional short syllable at the close of the first hemistich. *Helena* 1479, as noted above, is corrupt.

Finally, if we follow Christ and include among our examples *Helena* 1479-80 = 1496-7, the result is not only two pentameters which, as we have said above, have a spondee in the second hemistich, but, if the text of the antistrophe is correct, both pentameters must have been read with anacrusis. I confess that, except for Christ, I should not have thought of these lines as pentameters. The antistrophe begins:

μύλοιτέ ποθ' ἵππιον οἶμα
 δι' αἰθέρος ἕμενοι
 παῖδες Τυνδαρίδαι

I scanned these as two prosodiaci followed by one dactylic tripod catalectic as a clausula, which is its most common use.²

But at all events, even if we drop out this example, and also Eurip. *I. T.* 1235-6 = 1260-1 which, as shown by Bruhn's critical note, is more than doubtful for purposes of metre, it still seems clear to me that the peculiarities we have noted point, one and all, to the conclusion that these "dramatic pentameters," which even in the time of Euripides have the air of being old-fashioned, are not pentameters at all and were never intended to be, but rather pairs of dactylic tripodies catalectic. When compared with the regular elegiac pentameter both their freedoms and their restrictions suggest it. The elegiac pentameter, though originally a compound verse, is very distinctly an unity. The difference between this verse and a pair of verses, especially in this discussion, is important. If we consider these examples as pairs of verses all the peculiarities observed are amply explained and justified.

¹ I say nineteen instead of eleven because strophe does not match antistrophe in a peculiarity of this sort, and hence the pair should not be counted as one.

² See 693, 1499, 1508 of the same play, *Hippol.* 59, etc., and Christ, p. 151. For this use of prosodiaci in pairs, which is not unusual, comp. Aisch. *S. T.* 751-2 = 759-60, Soph. *Antig.* 353-4 = 365-6, and Christ, p. 214.

Taken as pairs of dactylic tripodies catalectic the occurrence of spondees would be exceptional anyhow, but not more so in one line than in the other. Conversely, pure dactyls are just as desirable in one as in the other.

So, too, whether the dactylic tripod catalectic is used singly, or as a clausula, which is its most common application, or in pairs, as in the examples before us, or in a series, as Eurip. *Troad.* 1094, f., the final syllable of it is long. Exceptions though rare are not more so in one than in another verse of a given series. In our dramatic examples, as it happens, all the exceptions were found in the first verse, which reverses the occasional license discovered in the elegiac pentameter of a short syllable at the end, not of the first, but of the second hemistich. In other words, in a pair of dactylic tripodies catalectic the two verses practically stand on the same footing.

Finally, we saw that at *Kyklops* 74 and, if we accept the text, *I. T.* 1260-1, Euripides divided a proper noun, which was not a compound, between two tripodies. If these lines are really pentameters the author has given us the only two genuine exceptions to the rule of diaeresis that I find quoted.¹ If, however, as seems clear, they are not pentameters, but pairs of dactylic tripodies catalectic, Euripides was quite within his rights in availing himself of a license for which there are parallels on almost any page of Greek lyric poetry.

If I am right in believing that these dramatic verses are really pairs of tripodies, the pentameter with verses other than the hexameter, so far as I have observed, is confined to a single case. This is an epitaph of four lines from Ithaka and belonging to the Macedonian period.² The pentameter takes the place of the usual iambic trimeter catalectic to form a distich with the Fourth Archilochian. The regular combination is best known from Horace, *Odes*, I 4, 1, f., 'Solvitur acris hiems grata,' etc.

The form of this epitaph was evidently *ad hoc*. The poet really desired to write elegiac distichs but, like some other tombstone bards, found himself confronted not by a theory but by a condition. This was the corpse's name,³ *Εὐθύδαμος*, which will

¹ It has already been seen that the compound name in the example quoted by Hephaestion stands on a different footing.

² Kaibel, 187 = CIG, 1925: Allen, 'Greek Versification in Inscriptions,' Papers of the Am. School at Athens, vol. IV, p. 44.

³ For similar difficulties compare Kaibel, 211 (hex. + iamb. trim. + two distichs), and 117 (same + three distichs).

not submit to the distich because it contains a cretic. The nearest approach to the hexameter was the Archilochian, while for the second line the poet returned to the pentameter because, from their character and associations, iambic verses are repugnant to the solemnity of the epitaph.

B. Use of the pentameter as a monostich.

Here the material collected is considerable and yields interesting results.

The two¹ oldest and most famous are the composition of Hipparchos and, therefore, may be dated in the sixth century before Christ. They are quoted by Plato, *Hipparch.* 228, D f. He says that Hipparchos set up Hermae along the roads, etc., and after selecting the wisest sayings he could discover or devise, 'ταῦτα αὐτὸς ἐντείνας εἰς ἐλεγείον,' had them inscribed on these Hermae for the instruction of the travelling public. There are two of these inscriptions, says Plato. On the left of each Hermes he is made to say, ὅτι ἐν μέσῳ τοῦ ἄστεος καὶ τοῦ δήμου ἔστηκεν²; on the right, he is made to say, Μνήμα τόδ' Ἰππάρχου· στείχε δίκαια φρονῶν.

As one of the 'many fine poems' of Hipparchos on other Hermae, Plato also quotes:

Μνήμα τόδ' Ἰππάρχου· μὴ φίλον ἐξαπάτα.

Preger writes these two pentameters in such a way as to show that, in his opinion, they really form a distich with the hexameter which Plato is supposed to be quoting indirectly. Of course, this is not impossible, but I should prefer to follow Bergk and (probably) Crusius; first, because this use of the pentameter is well attested by other undoubted examples throughout antiquity; second, because not only were the supposed hexameter and the pentameter inscribed in different places but, also, because I fail to discover any connection in thought between them.³ It should also be observed that Plato's word ἐλεγείον is not infrequently applied to the pentameter alone.⁴

The sphere, content and purpose of these two verses are distinctly such as we might expect of a monostich. They actually

¹ Bergk, *PLG*⁴, II, p. 237; Crus., p. 123, and *adnot.* p. xxxv; Preger, p. 157; Wachsmuth, *Stadt Athen*, I, p. 498, II, p. 391; Bergk, *Gr. Lit.* II, p. 175.

² For the various more or less futile attempts to restore these words to a hexameter, see the authorities quoted in note 16, with references.

³ Comp. for example, the 'restorations' mentioned in Wachsmuth, l. c.

⁴ So Plutarch, 1141 A; Schol. Arist. *Pax*, 1199.

were inscriptions. Moreover, we are safe in assuming that, although only these two examples happen to have survived, such single pentameters were an ordinary thing, especially in this very period when, as Bergk, *GL.* II 175, has observed, the tendency to versify popular wisdom was so marked. Plato himself speaks of the 'many other beautiful poems' of Hipparchos and expressly states that they were meant to offset, if not replace, rival wisdom at Delphi, *γνώθι σαυτόν, μηδὲν ἄγαν*, and the like. In that case the political object and significance of *μνημα τόδ' Ἰππάρχου* is clear enough. Why the most natural and most common form of the monostich, the hexameter, was not used is a question to which I shall return later.

Other cases which I noted in Greek literature were, for the most part, more doubtful. Though a given pentameter may have been quoted singly, and also contain an independent gnome, we cannot be certain that it was written as a monostich unless so stated by the author who quotes it. Cases of this sort are:

Solon, 6, Cr.; 7, B.,

ἐργασιν ἐν μεγάλοις πᾶσιν ἀδεῖν χαλεπὸν

Kritias, 4, Cr.; 6, B.,

ἐκ μελέτης πλείους ἢ φύσεως ἀγαθοί

Frag. Eleg. Adesp., 12 Cr.

τὸν φρουρὸν φρουρεῖν χρή, τὸν ἐρῶντα δ' ἐρᾶν.

Simonid., 70, Cr.; 87, B.,

Ζεὺς πάντων αὐτὸς φάρμακα μῦθος ἔχει.

In all such cases as these the difficulty of reaching a definite conclusion is still further increased by the fact that in the distich the gnome, if there is one, is always found, naturally and historically, in the pentameter.

A better case is a line of Evenos, quoted by Plutarch, 497, A (Comp. Cr. 6, B. II 271, Preger, 50):

*ὥστε ἐπαινεῖσθαι καὶ μνημονεύεσθαι τοῦ Εὐήνου τοῦτο μόνον ὡς ἐπέγραψεν
ἢ δέος ἢ λύπη παῖς πατρὶ πάντα χρόνον.*

Doehner, says Bergk, emended to *τοῦτο τὸ μονόστιχον ἐπίγραμμα*, after Hecker, who thought the verse sepulchral. According to this Plutarch expressly stated that the pentameter of Evenos was a monostich. But the emendation is not called for. We must, therefore, leave the question unanswered—which seems safer than to assume with Preger that the verse was *not* a monostich.

A still better example occurs in the life of Aischylos found in some MSS.¹ Here the author says, in conclusion :

ἐπιγέγραπται τῷ τάφῳ αὐτοῦ·
αἰετοῦ ἐξ ὀνύχων βρέγμα τυπεῖς ἔθανον,

referring, of course, to the famous story of the death of Aischylos.²

This,³ and the fragment of Evenos quoted by Plutarch, *Mor.* 497, A, seem to me tolerably clear cases of the pentameter used as a monostich. Moreover, though the other four are by no means attested, they are quite possible.

Turning now to Greek inscriptions I find that, although in many cases their dates can not be fixed, single pentameters are found all the way from the fifth century before Christ.

Pausan., 5, 27, 2; Preger, 55:

Φόρμις ἀνέθηκεν
Ἀρκὰς Μαινάλιος, νῦν δὲ Συρακόσιος.

This was the inscription on the bronze horses dedicated at Olympia by Phormis, the general of Hiero and Gelo.⁴

Exactly parallel is one set up by Herodes Atticus some centuries later. Comp. Kaibel, 1090; Philostratos, II, p. 66 (K): CIG, I, 989:

Ἡρώς Πολυδευκίων,
ταῖσδ' ἐπὶ ποτ' ἐν τριόδοις σὺν σοὶ ἐπεστρεφόμην.

A third is found on a lamp in the British Museum:⁵

εἰμὶ δὲ Πανσανίου τοῦ καταπυγοτάτου,

where, although I find only the single line quoted in Kaibel, and the Arch. Zeit. for 1873 is not available to me, the δέ evidently implies some preceding statement regarding the maker.⁶

¹ For the text of this life, see Weil, *Aeschylus*, Teubner, 1891, p. 312; Sedgwick, *Aeschylus*, Oxford, s. d. end; Preger, p. 205; Westermann's *Biographi Graeci*, Brunswick, 1845, p. 122.

² Discussed by E. Rohde, *JJ*, 121, p. 22, f.

³ "Apparently a fragment of some late epigram on the poet, though I grant that some one may have composed this single pentameter." Preger, p. 205. Comp. Preger, No. 39, and Westermann, *Biographi Graeci*, Brunswick, 1845, p. 120.

⁴ Comp. Gurlitt on *Pausan.* 5, 27, 2. Bergk, *Opusc.* II, p. 400, attempted to write as three verses. But comp. Preger, p. 45.

⁵ Kaibel, 1131; Allen, p. 43; Hirschfeld, *Arch. Zeit.*, 1873, p. 109.

⁶ *καταπυγοτάτου* is a pleasantry which was to be expected of any antique lamp as the confidant of the small hours. Comp. Arist. *Eccles.* I, f.; Anth. Gr. V. 3, 4, 6, 7, etc.

A different type is represented by Kaibel, 759; Hirschfeld, Arch. Zeit., 1873, p. 108:

Πύθων Ἑρμῇ ἄγαλμα Ἑρμοστράτου Ἀβδηρίτης
 ἐστησεμπολλὰς θησάμενος πόλης.
 Ἐνφρων ἐξεποίησ' οὐκ ἄδαῃς Πάριος.

Here the distich is the real inscription. The following pentameter is independent, since it is the artist's signature. To the same category belongs Allen, LXXXII; Löwy, 88; CIG, 2984. In Kaibel, 806, the pentameter really forms an independent inscription.

Lastly, the two following *dedicationes* consist each of merely a single pentameter and, with requisite changes, were, doubtless, often repeated:

CIA, IV, 2, p. 262 (1558, L),

Πειθοὶ Καλλίμα[χος] τήνδ' ἀνέθηκε Σολεύς.

This was found on the Eleusinian way and one hemistich is written above the other.

The second is from Posidonia and written to the left (Allen, p. 200; IGA. 542; Curtius, Arch. Zeit. 38, p. 27):

Τάθάναι Φιλλῶ Χαρμυλίδα δεκάτα[ν].

A survey of poetical inscriptions on the Roman side reveals a considerable number of single pentameters.¹ I may quote:

Buech., 886; CIL, XIV, 2773 (comp. Kaib. 829):

Hortulus hic Vari est opus Alcinoi.

On a Hermes. The hemistichs are separated.

Buech., 921:

Crux est vita mihi, mors, inimice, tibi.

On a golden cross in the grave of a Christian buried in the Basilica di San Lorenzo.

Buech., 933; CIL, IV, 1880:

At quem non ceno, barbarus ille mihi est.

Preceded by *L. Istacidi* (vocative). A Pompeian *graffito* in which *at quem* belongs to the same sphere of Latinity as the *foras cenat* of Petron. 30.

¹ Buecheler, Carm. Epig. Nos. 886; 921; 933; 952; 962(?); 1451 f.; 1491; 1492 (a quotation from *Mart.* 2, 59, 4); 1493; 1501 f.; 1124 (probably belongs to a longer epitaph); 1291.

Buech., 952; CIL, IV, 1118, *add.* p. 203. Another Pompeian *graffito* founded on Propertius, 3 (4), 23, 6:

Iam docui silices verba [benigna] loqui.

Buech., 962; CIL, X, 1284. At Nola:

Nardu poeta pudens hoc tegitur tumulo.

Buech., 1452; CIL, II, *suppl.* 5241, Hübner:

Dic rogo qui transis sit tibi terra levis.

The important part of this pentameter, 'sit tibi terra levis,' is, deservedly, a great favorite with the epitaphs. In the form 'dic rogo praeteriens sit tibi,' etc. (B. 1453), and 'praeteriens dicas sit tibi,' etc. (B. 1454), it is so common as to be abbreviated to *sttl*. Sometimes (1452-5) a pentameter containing these words is added, as a clausula, to prose. Again (1456-7) it is added to a hexameter and we have a sort of distich by aggregation. So, too, such an irregular combination as Buech. 1451; CIL, II 558:

Tu qui carpis iter gressu properante viator
Siste gradum quaeso, quod peto parva mora est,
Oro ut praeteriens dicas: s. t. t. l.

is merely due to the aggregation of a distich with the favorite line of the bereaved. A large majority of irregularities in the epitaphs and other inscriptions are clearly due to similar processes of construction and, of course, call for no discussion here. Again the *sttl* is preceded by *optamus cuncti* (1460), *omnis optamus* (1461), *et tu qui dederis* (1462).

Other, probably conventional, pentameters are Buech. 1464-5, 1491 and 1493. Buech. 1492; Hübner, *Insc. Brit. Christ.* 134, is a quotation of Martial, II 59, 4. Buech. 1503 may also be mentioned. But 1124 probably belongs to a longer epitaph. Finally some others might be added which, at first sight, would appear to belong in other categories.

A survey of these examples collected from both Latin and Greek is attended, it seems to me, with some interesting results. Omitting those which perhaps may be considered as favorite quotations from a pattern distich and, at times, still found in a distich, we still have about a score of pentameters which can hardly be termed anything but monostichs. It is true that this seems a small number to glean from so long a period of poetical activity. But the tradition of them is unbroken and their nature and use imply the existence in antiquity of many others like them.

The usual verse to be employed as a monostich is the hexameter. Why use the pentameter, which from a very early period and, one might say, more than any other verse in all antiquity, was identified with one form and one only?

Adopting the generally accepted theory of origin for both hexameter and pentameter, with which I see no reason for disagreeing, it seems not unreasonable to look for an answer in the consideration of the shorter dactylic verses which are older than either of them. The dactylic tripod catalectic, for example, is certainly one of the oldest of all Greek verses.¹ Proverbs, sayings, brief votive inscriptions and the like primitive types of formal composition ought to be among the first to appear in metre and, as a matter of fact, whatever its origin and other uses, the tripod, in its employment as a single verse, lies, to a marked degree, within this sphere. That it was frequently and naturally used in pairs at a very early period is suggested, for example, by the fact that the regular pentameter itself was afterwards derived from that combination.

Now, when we observe that the regular elegiac pentameter, until, as in the dramatic examples, we pause to examine details, bears so close a resemblance to the double tripodies from which it developed; also, that, in this use as a monostich, the pentameter is so distinctly confined to proverbs and old said sooth, *ex-votis* and similar primitive themes of composition; may we not believe that after it rose and developed in connection with the hexameter, the pentameter, as an inevitable result of its wider fame as well as its close resemblance, finally absorbed the somewhat humble and contracted sphere in which the use of a pair of tripodies had survived from a remote antiquity? In the earliest times the real distinction, in form and sphere, between these single pairs of tripodies and the regular elegiac pentameter would, naturally, be recognized. Indeed, all the way down, it was never altogether forgotten. Compare, for instance, the notably strong pause between hemistichs as well as their independence in such ancient examples as the lines of Hipparchos.² Centuries later, the strong hiatus in such a case as,

Hortulus hic Vari est opus Alcinoi,

leads to the same conclusion. Even the conservatism, observed

¹ See Christ, par. 190.

² Bergk, *Opusc.* II 400, does write as three verses the Phormis inscription (*Paus.* 5, 27, 2) which belongs to the fifth century B. C.

in some of these inscriptions, of writing one tripod above the other—although not always demanded by the shape of the object—is not without some weight in the same connection. On the other hand, the fact that Plato calls the verse of Hipparchos an *ελεγίον* needs mean no more than that, in this particular sphere, the confusion of tripodies and pentameter was already accomplished. But although the original form may have become completely identified with that found in the better known distich, yet the process lingered in the persistent tradition that in some way or other it was entirely proper to use the elegiac pentameter as a monostich within the limits of the sphere originally occupied by the double tripod.

When, therefore, in the fourth century after Christ we find Professor Ausonius choosing to put seven saws of Anacharsis¹ into as many pentameters, we may assert that he is following a well established tradition which, in examples still surviving, can be traced back to an exactly parallel use of Hipparchos, nearly a thousand years before. In all that period the sphere of the pentameter as a monostich coincides exactly with that of the form which it absorbed. I know of no surviving example which transgresses the rule.

C. The pentameter *κατὰ στίχον* is very rarely used. The earliest is an old votive inscription quoted by Aristotle, *Ἀθην. Πολ.*, 7, 4:

Διφίλων Ἀνθεμίων τήνδ' ἀνέθηκε θεοῖς,
θητικού ἀντὶ τέλους ἱππᾶδ' ἀμειψάμενος.²

Three more cases are found in Kaibel (326, 510 and 605). The first is an epitaph of the third or fourth century A. D. found in Thasos. The writer is one Aurelius Philippos of Abdera. His style betrays several marked Latinisms, and the two pentameters standing in the midst of his prose are unusually bad. The second is also late and not much better. 605 (CIG, 6209) is the best. It is the epitaph of a comic actor buried at Messina:

Παφιανὸς Πάφιος τῆδ' ὑπὸ γῇ λέλυμε,
κωμῳδὸς λιφθεὶς τὸν βίον στέφανον.

Neither this nor the ancient verses quoted by Aristotle belong to the stage of culture represented by Aurelius and the "two worthy heroes" of Kaibel, 510.

¹ Auson., p. 249, Schenkl. This form should not be cited as a case of the pentameter *κατὰ στίχον*. It is a mere bundle of monostichs.

² See Herwerden and Kenyon here. Also quoted by Pollux, VIII 131.

On the literary side the most interesting example is the *Anthologia Graeca*, XIII 1, an epigram, and apparently the introductory epigram, of Philippos who lived near the time of Tiberius and was the compiler of the second anthology.¹ The poem consists of five pentameters. The first is pure, the second has a spondee in the first place, the third, a spondee in the first two places, and so on in regular succession until the last line which has nothing but spondees, as the first had nothing but dactyls. The period was one in which, as we learn from several sources,² all sorts of experiments in metre were being tried, but whether this form was a special creation of Philippos I cannot say. At any rate the observed use of the pentameter, or what was taken for the pentameter, *κατὰ στίχον* was probably the suggestion of it, and the appearance of it in literature tends to show that it was more common than the scanty remains might, otherwise, have led one to suppose.³

The Latin inscriptions yield no examples of the pentameter *κατὰ στίχον*. But from the literature three cases are cited by Müller, *de Re Met.*, p. 103:

Lampridius, *vita Diadum. Hist. Aug. XVI 7, 3*:

“Commodus Herculeum nomen habere cupit,
Antoninorum non putat esse bonum,
Expers humani iuris et imperii,
Sperans quin etiam clarius esse deum,
Quam si sit princeps nominis egregii.
Non erit iste deus nec tamen ullus homo,”

Hi versus a Graeco nescio quo compositi a malo poeta in Latinum translati sunt, etc.”

It would appear to be the form of these verses which prompted the criticism of Lampridius. If so, the opinion of it, even as late as the third century and from a man no better educated than Lampridius, is of interest. Doubtless the tendency, now and then, to write just such verses as these is what called forth the statement of Atilius Fortunatianus, VI 291, 18, K, that the pentameter ‘seorsum ac solitarium carmen facere non potest.’⁴

The second case belongs to the time of Honorius and is the

¹ See Christ, *GL*, p. 620 (Müller's Handb. vol. VII).

² See, for example, Teuffel-Schwabe, *Röm. Lit.* 282, 3 (Remmius Palaemon).

³ Compare Buecheler, *Rhein. Mus.* 38, 111 and the *πεντάμετρον ἐπικόν* (pure spondees) of Helios, *Stud.*, p. 145, and *Tract. Harl. Stud.*, p. 17, 24.

⁴ Hephaist., p. 52, W.; Schol., p. 171 f.; Aristid., p. 52; Terent. Maur. 1721 f.

composition of Martianus Capella (907, p. 339, Eyss.). It consists of 27 pentameters. The technique, on the whole, is correct enough, although the worthy African evidently found nothing to displease him in a succession of three verses like these,

Quo fertur rabidas perdomuisse feras,
Quo vidit rigidas glandibus ire comas
Ismaros et silvas currere monte suas.

From the same period and the same part of the world comes a Greek *ᾠδή* composed by Heliodoros (Aethiopica, 3, 2, p. 79, Bekk.) and supposed to be sung in honor of Peleus and Thetis at a Thessalian festival and sacrifice:

Τὰν Θέτιν αἰίδω, χρυσόθειρα Θέτιν,
Νηρέος ἀθανάταν εἰναλίοιο κόραν
Τὰν Διὸς ἐννεσίῃ Πηλεΐ γημαμέναν,
Τὰν ἀλὸς ἀγλαίαν, ἀμετέραν Παφίην

and so on for thirteen lines with a goodly sprinkling of Doric and ending with a repetition of the first line.

The third case¹ quoted by Müller is Ausonius, 11 (Sch. p. 63), a laudatory poem addressed to his colleagues in the University of Bordeaux. But, although the text tradition is very unsatisfactory, a moment's examination of these lines will show that they were never intended for anything but dactylic tripodies catalectic, and so, in fact, Schenkl arranges them. If we arrange as pentameters the first hemistich contains pure dactyls in every case but three. There are, also, two cases of hiatus after the final syllable of the first hemistich. These facts are the more significant because Ausonius makes a large use of the distich elsewhere and writes it well. The poem does not belong to the same type as those quoted from Capella and Heliodoros.

The well known verses of the Vergilian tradition, 'Sic vos non vobis,' etc. (Vita Verg. 69-70, Heyne-Wag, p. xcix, etc.) are not to be included here since, as Müller, l. c. observes (comp. Hermann, *El. d. met.*, p. 360), the hexameter

Hos ego versiculos feci; tulit alter honores;

was to be supplied with each one of the four 'sic vos non vobis'

¹ Müller does not give the reference, but he can hardly refer to the monostichs of Anacharsis, and 11 is the only other piece that could have been meant.

after they had been filled out by the missing words, thus making four complete distichs.¹

These are all the cases of the pentameter *κατὰ στίχον* in Greek and Latin which I have happened to discover. Examples are much more rare than those of the pentameter as a monostich and the usage never rose to the same plane of culture. Nevertheless, it also began in the early period, continued to occur with considerable frequency, was even developed for literary purposes and, as we have seen, finally ran out in the theory of an epic form consisting entirely of spondees. This ought to imply many more examples than we now possess. Especially interesting is the type given by Heliodoros.

Such an enormous prolongation of life for this weakly changing seems, in itself, to betray the tonic effects of some sort of secondary theorizing. The pentameter as a monostich may have been the analogy in part, but I am inclined to think that the persistency of the pentameter *κατὰ στίχον* was, also, partly due to a confusion of it with the tripod used in multiples of two. It is quite true that, as far as extant literature is concerned, the use of the dactylic tripod catalectic more than twice in succession is extremely rare. Still, no less a poet than Euripides (*Troad.* 1094) used it so once, nor is the testimony of Ausonius, eight centuries later, to be despised, since it doubtless rests on ancient tradition now lost to us.

The hymn of Heliodoros to Peleus and Thetis, one of the latest manifestations of this subject so long popular,² was undoubtedly intended for pentameters. Like the verses of Capella it seems to belong to the period of late African culture. I cannot discover that it has any roots, so far as form is concerned, in an earlier choral literature, Greek or Latin.

¹Quamobrem [Bathyllus] donatus honoratusque a Caesare fuit, quod aequo animo non ferens Vergilius, iisdem valvis affixit quater hoc principium: *sic vos non vobis*; postulabat Augustus ut hi versus complerentur; quod cum frustra aliqui conati essent, Vergilius praeposito disticho sic subiunxit:

Hos ego versiculos feci; tulit alter honores:
Sic vos non vobis nidificatis aves.
Sic vos non vobis vellera fertis oves.
Sic vos non vobis mellificatis apes.
Sic vos non vobis fertis aratra boves.

²See Ellis, *Introd. to Catullus LXIV*, p. 278; Reitzenstein, *Die Hochzeit des Peleus und der Thetis*, *Hermes*, XXXV, 73 f.

II.

Cases in which the pentameter occurs with the hexameter, but irregularly. The most notable of these is the one in which we find:

A. The usual position of hexameter and pentameter reversed.

Our information regarding this form and, to a large extent, our best examples of it are due to Athenaios. In connection with a story which smacks strongly of later times Athenaios, 602, C, tells us that some persons who proposed to make away with Phalaris, the famous tyrant of Agrigentum, 570-550, B. C., consulted the oracle on the subject and received the following reply:

Εὐδαίμων Χαρίτων καὶ Μελάνιππος ἔφην,
θείας ἀγητῆρες ἑφαμερίοις φιλότατος.¹

"In later times," adds Athenaios, "this form was used by Dionysios Chalkus, the Athenian,² in his elegies." Dionysios belonged to the fifth century B. C. and led a colony to Thurii (Plut. Nik. 6). The rest of his history, so far as we know it, is largely preserved in his nickname of ὁ Χαλκοῦς, the "Copperite," derived, as Athenaios (669, D) also tells us, from his advocacy of a financial system based on the same principles as that advocated by the Honorable William Jennings Bryan. His poetry seems to have been about as much below par as the coin which his policy contemplated. Owing to accident of quotation, only the first two fragments happen to begin with pentameters. An examination of these, especially the first, which apparently formed a portion of his dedication, tends to show that Dennis Cheap-money did not alter the usual pauses and sentence construction of the regular distich to fit his new scheme. For example, a majority of his pentameters coincide, at the close, with a distinct pause in sense. If these peculiarities were carried through his work the result would be that little else but the first and last line of an elegy could remind us that the form was abnormal, and we should fail to get the effect—inartistic but curious—which, otherwise, might have been produced. It would be interesting to know whether the mental attitude which prompted the deliberate choice of such a form was reflected in oddities of literary style,

¹ Also quoted by Eusebios, Praep. Evang. V 35, 2.

² Osann, Beiträge, etc., 1835, I, pp. 79-140; Christ, *GL.*, p. 133; Bergk, *GL.* II 511; Welcker, *Kl. Schr.* II, p. 220. Fragments in Crusius, p. 129; Bergk, *PLG.*⁴ II, p. 262.

but the fragments are too scanty to judge. There is nothing to show that either in Greek or Latin literature this form was ever attempted again. Moreover, it is worth noting that Dionysios' experiment belongs in the period after the art of the old Ionian masters had, to a certain extent, been lost and before its attempted recovery by the Alexandrian poets. Whether he found his suggestion in forms like the oracle quoted by Athenaios or was simply moved to turn the distich bottom side up as an experiment it is impossible to say. But primitive forms like the oracle are probably due to accident and to be considered ancient folk variations of the hexameter rather than of the distich.¹ Kaibel's collection yields no further examples of this form, and Buech. 1202 and 1308, the two cases found among Latin inscriptions, are too irregular and corrupt to be of any importance.

B. Among the cases in which one or more regular distichs are followed by some irregularity at the end of the piece may be mentioned: One distich followed by one pentameter.

Kaibel, 589, 759 and 806. The irregularity of 759 and 806 is more apparent than real. The third line is the artist's inscription and, therefore, to be counted as a single pentameter. 589 is the result of collocation, that is, the third line appears to be a favorite sentiment from another source tacked on at the end.

In the same manner Buech. 1020, 1039, 1082, 1193, 1220, 1326, 1482 are the result of collocation merely. Buech. 880, the one example remaining, was scratched on the Memnon Statue, May 21, 134 A. D.:

Horam cum primam cumque horam sole secundam
proluta Oceano luminat alma dies,
Vox audita mihi est ter bene Memnonia,

where the third line betrays the amateur. Underneath is written: "... epistr]ategus Thebaidos fecit cum audit Memnonem XI Kal. Iun. Serviano III cos. cum Asidonia Galla uxore." This type is not found in literature.

Cases of two or more distichs followed by a pentameter are found only in Latin inscriptions. These are Buech. 1085, 1121, 1123 and 1124, all bad, and all the result of collocation.

Of those cases in which one or more distichs are followed by one or more hexameters only one variety seems to deserve mention. This is: One distich followed by one hexameter, or one distich and a half.

¹ See Usener, *Altg. Versbau*, p. 99.

Kaibel, 34, 75, 140, 172 (mutilated), 273, 296, 468, 697a (indexed 597a, by mistake), 750 (frag.), 1007. The best are Kaibel, 75, CIG, 749:

Πολλὰ μεθ' ἡλικίας ὁμοήλικος ἡδέα παῖσας
ἐκ γαίας βλαστὼν γαῖα πάλιν γέγονα·
εἰμὶ δὲ Ἀριστοκλῆς Πειραιεύς, παῖς δὲ Μένωνος.

Fourth or third century. For the second line K. quotes Theog. 878, Eurip. Frag. 757 (N). K. 35 and 273 belongs to the same type.

Kaibel, 1007, CIG, Add. III 4761 c. (on the Memnon Statue):

Εἰ καὶ λαβητῆρες ἐλυμήναντο δέμας σόν,
ἀλλὰ σὺ γ' αὐθής, ὥς κλύον αὐτὸς ἐγώ.
Μέττιος, ὦ Μέμνον, Παίων τάδ' ἐγραψε Σιδήτης.

The cases found in the Latin inscriptions are Buecheler, 1010, 1089, 1090, 1092, 1146, 1267, 1489. The best is 1489; CIL. II 4426; AL. Burm. IV 14:

Aspice quam subito marcet quod floruit ante,
aspice quam subito quod stetit ante cadit,
nascentes morimur finisque ab origine pendet.

Here the third line is a quotation from Manilius IV 14.

No cases occur in Latin literature. But in Greek literature I found two interesting examples:

Krates¹ Παίγνια, Anth. Gr. X 104:

Χαῖρε, θεὰ δέσποινα, σοφῶν ἀνδρῶν ἀγάπημα,
Εὐτελεῖη, κλεινῆς ἐγγονε Σωφροσύνης·
σὴν ἀρετὴν τιμῶσιν, ὅσοι τὰ δίκαι' ἀσκοῦσιν.

Ammonios,² Anthol. Pal. IX 827:

Εἰμὶ μὲν εὐκεράοιο φίλος θεράπων Διονύσου,
λείβω δ' ἀργυρέων ὕδατα Ναϊάδων,
θέλγω δ' ἡρεμέοντα νέον περὶ κώματι παῖδα.

To a Satyr standing by a spring and watching a Cupid asleep.

Without doubt there were many more cases of this form which we no longer possess. Some are the result of mere collocation or inexperience, but others are complete and deliberate. The form rose to literature, but only in the inscriptional sphere, so far

¹ See Christ, *GL*, p. 133; Susemihl, vol. I, p. 29 f.

² Jacobs, Anth. XIII 841; Christ, *GL*, p. 784. But esp. Reitzenstein, Pauly-Wiss. I, p. 1862, no. 11.

as one may judge from the two surviving examples just quoted. The suitable length for inscriptions had something to do with the popularity of this pattern. But the principal cause of its frequency and rise to a higher plane of culture as well as of its longevity was its quasi balance and symmetry. From this point of view the form is rather to be considered a single stanza than a distich followed by a pentameter. Forms which are cognate but not symmetrical in the same way never rose and were never popular. Such are the cases of one distich followed by two hexameters (K. 90, 490, 522, 545a; Buech. 922, 947), or by three hexameters (K. 277, 291, 386, 452c), or two or more distichs followed by one hexameter (Buech. 949, 1012, 1107, 1302).

C. Finally, we may consider those cases in which a single pentameter has been used to conclude a series of two or more hexameters. On the whole, this forms one of the most interesting and important of the aberrant types considered. The principle of composition is clear and, as far as it goes, logical. Moreover, it is artistic enough to have a certain literary value. The most striking as well as the most frequent of these types and the one which first called my attention to the subject is:

Two hexameters followed by one pentameter. Nine examples are found in Latin inscriptions. These are Buecheler, 1105, 1179, 1260, 1292, 1324, 1328, [1158, 1173, 1190].

Buech. 1105, CIL, XIV 316:

Hic sum positus qui semper sine crimine vixi,
Et quem mi dederat cursum Fortuna peregit,
Cuius ossua et cineres hic lapis intus habet.

This epitaph doubtless occurred, with slight changes, scores of times on gravestones of the period, not only because the sentiment is often repeated elsewhere, but, also, because this particular stone, which comes from Ostia, was put up in honor of one Epaphroditus, a *Sevir Augustalis* and a *Quinquennialis*, by his quondam associates in those offices. These were men whose knowledge of literature and whose ideas of an appropriate epitaph would be about the same as those possessed by an average city council of to-day. No doubt, on that occasion, the committee resorted to a source not unlike that which supplies metrical consolation to the bereaved relatives of the obituary column maintained by the morning paper. Rearrangement to *hic positus sum* would make the first line metrical. The verse is conven-

tional for epitaphs. For the second line compare Vergil, *A.* IV 653 and Buech. l. c. 385 and 814. *Peregit* for *peregi* is explained by *Fortuna* and is probably due to the stone-cutter.

Buecheler, 1179, CIL, 8553 is perhaps the result of collocation:

Hic iacet ille situs M[arcus] formonsior ullo.
quod meruit vivus, moriens quot et ipse rogavit,
Coniugi sue gratae praestitit ecce fides.

The first line is the usual 'hic iacet,' etc. plus a reminiscent cadence. The second and third lines, i. e. the distich, are the common property of epitaphs. Compare B 1180 and 1181, also the first line of 1182. These explain how the bereaved Ulpia Veneria came to compose the epitaph in its present form. She indicated the place of her husband's burial and told how handsome he was.¹ She then desired a sentiment and the choice was a distich which she had read on other gravestones and which had struck her fancy. It will be seen, therefore, that in this case the form was not intended, but due, simply, to the juxtaposition of favorite sentiments. Indeed a large proportion of the irregularities of the elegiac distich is due to this method of composition. *Hoc* for *sue* would have improved the pentameter, but the fact that she was *his* wife was more important to Ulpia Veneria than a mere detail of metre.

In the same way B. 1260 is the result of collocation. B. 1292 is conventional. B. 1324 and 1328 belong to a lower sphere. B. 1158, 1173 and 1190 are attached to other distichs and therefore should not be counted here.

So far the sphere and social position of this form are clearly indicated. Moreover, the character as well as the frequency of surviving examples suggest how abundant it must have been and therefore how familiar to every Roman in the days when the roads leading out of any Italian town were lined with tombs.

Two cases, only, occur in Latin literature, but they are the stock examples of aberrancy in the form of the elegiac distich. Both are the composition of Trimalchio, who, among his many accomplishments, derived great comfort from courting the muse (comp. 41).

¹ The reference to personal beauty in ancient epitaphs is frequent and eminently characteristic. Comp. the epitaph of Scipio, B. 7 (CIL, I, 30); B. 52, 75, 80, 98, 237, 454, 969, 989, 995, 1033, 1035, 1038, 1040, 1044, 1057, 1061, 1136, 1137, 1151, 1188, 1240, 1307, 1329. Kaibel, 132, 151, 152, 169, 174.

Petron. 35: "While we were drinking . . . a slave brought in a silver skeleton so constructed that the joints and vertebrae could be turned in every direction. After he had thrown it down on the table a few times and the mechanism had struck several different attitudes, Trimalchio added:

'eheu nos miseros, quam totus homuncio nil est.
Sic erimus cuncti, postquam nos auferet Orcus.
Ergo vivamus, dum licet esse bene.¹'"

As one might say in doggerel not much worse:

'Poor wretches we—alack, the thought
That man, weak man, all told, is naught!
When Death has claw'd us with his clutch
Most certain 'tis that even such
As this is now we all shall be,
So let us live as best we may
Until that day!'

Of course, Burmann, Friedlaender and others are entirely correct in their observation that this form is characteristic of uneducated people and that in using it here Petronius meant to display Trimalchio's lack of training as compared with his pretensions in the polite accomplishment of turning a distich.

But this is not all. We have already seen that this form suggests the epitaph, the freedman's epitaph. We even have something very much like the favorite juxtaposition of sentiments. Here are three independent separable verses in a row. Nor is it alone in form that this 'poem' of Trimalchio suggests the epitaph. In its content also it is an epitaph pure and simple. Is it going too far to suggest that in actually making it an epitaph, in inserting the stock phrases and reflections so dear to the monumental songsters of Trimalchio's class, Petronius may have meant to imply that he was practically palming off a time-honored roadside friend as his own composition? As though some modern Trimalchio, under the same circumstances, should remark: "By the way, that reminds me of a little poem of my own:

'Stay traveller as you pass by,
As you are now so once was I;
As I am now so you must be,
Prepare for death and follow me,'"

lines familiar to any one who has ever seen a country grave-yard.

¹ The attempts of the old commentators quoted in Burmann's note to emend these verses illustrate the value of epigraphical study.

At any rate, in using this form Petronius certainly had in mind just such *obiter dicta* as we have been considering and as were perfectly familiar to all his readers.

The second example (Petron. 55) which Trimalchio calls an *inscriptio* and Sam Weller would, no doubt, describe as "a verse," belongs in the same category:

"We applauded his course and . . . fell into a discussion, illustrated by various examples, on the sudden changes to which human affairs are subjected. 'Yes,' said Trimalchio, 'it wont do to let this chance go by without a verse on it.' So saying, he at once called for his tablets, and without any long thought read out these:

"Quod non expectes, ex transverso fit,
et supra nos Fortuna negotio curat,
quare da nobis vina Falerna, puer,

(You're certain to be crost
When you least expect it most.
Fortune rules the roast
We find it to our cost,
So come, boy, pass the wine
I prefer Falernian)."

This composition which, in the line following, Petronius properly terms an *epigramma* is called by Trimalchio an *inscriptio*. The difference is worth noting and again suggests the monumental sphere and inspiration of Trimalchio's muse. Whether in poetry, in the rhetorical schools, in popular phrase, and above all, of course, in epitaphs, scarcely another theme in antiquity was so frequently taken up as the mutability of Fortune.¹ Trimalchio's ideas and expression regarding this subject are eminently those of the tombstone. As before, the lines are independent and separable. The imperfection of the first two lines is, without doubt, original and intentional. Moreover, the inexperience of the writer is clearly portrayed in the heavy spondees and neglect of 'conflict.'

These two examples from Petronius appear to be the only specimens of this form now surviving in Roman literature. They are interesting, too, because we indirectly get the point of view of an educated man on them. This form clearly suggested epitaphs to cultivated Romans of the first century, and the remains as far as discovered have given the same impression to us.

¹ Juvenal, Sat. X; Iustinus, I 7, 14; Dio Chrys. *Orat.* LXIV, etc.

On the Greek side Kaibel's index notes ten cases,¹ beginning with 52, fourth century B. C., showing remains of the pre-Euclidean alphabet and apparently from a lower sphere of life. All but two are epitaphs and on a level with the Roman examples already quoted. K. 1008 is inscribed on the left thigh of the Memnon Statue, and the writer has copied his first verse badly from a neighboring inscription (K. 1007). K. 823, CI, 6012c is perhaps the most interesting. The inscription, which is before 370 A. D. is on an altar to Rhea raised by Crescens and Leontius and written as two stanzas.

But one of the most interesting cases is found in Appian, B. C. I 97, who tells us that Sulla, the dictator, in response to an oracle, sent as offerings to his patron deity Venus a crown of gold and a battle-axe accompanied by an inscription:

“ἐπεμψε δὲ καὶ στέφανον χρυσοῦν καὶ πέλεκυν, ἐπιγράψας τάδε·

‘τόνδε σοι αὐτοκράτωρ Σύλλας ἀνέθηκ’, Ἀφροδίτη,
ὥς εἶδον κατ’ ὄνειρον ἀνὰ στρατὴν διέπουσαν
τεύχεσι τοῖς Ἀρεὸς μαρναμένην ἐνοπλον.’”

Zeiss in his translation of Appian, Leipzig, 1837, thought that a pentameter had fallen out, but, as we have already seen, this is worth no more than similar emendations of Trimalchio's verses. There is no sign here that the text is corrupt, and no reason for questioning Appian's statement that these verses were the composition of the great dictator and for the purpose described.

It is hardly necessary to say that L. Cornelius Sulla was the antipodes of a Trimalchio. He was a man of cultivated tastes and varied accomplishments. His knowledge of Greek was practical and extensive, and his love of literature was no less genuine and active than his love of wine and women. The Romans had known and used the elegiac distich for a century. It was particularly affected by the contemporary school of Catulus and Licinus, and the movement destined shortly to produce the first great epigrammatist of Rome was already well under way.

Not only then was the distich well understood in general, but Sulla was the man of all men to understand it. He did not write his inscription in this form because he knew no better, but because he had good reason to think it proper for an *ex-voto*. So far, then, as Greek is concerned we must believe that this form, even

¹ Nos. 52, 132, 171, 370, 400, 662, 666, 687, 1008, 823.

at a tolerably early period, had more nearly attained a genuine literary position than it ever did in Latin, and had therefore occurred with much greater frequency than the remains would have suggested.¹ Another of the same form and intended for the titulus of a statue is Anthol. Pal. XIII 16. The author is not known.

Of the form, three hexameters followed by one pentameter, two cases, both well written, are found in Latin inscriptions:

B. 914; CIL, V, p. 617. In the church of St. Thecla, Milan. Attila destroyed the old church in 452. These verses refer to its restoration by Eusebius, 452-460.

B. 1188; CIL, VIII *Suppl.* 13110. In a tomb at Carthage belonging to the Caesars (Hadrian, etc.).

The Greek inscriptions yield ten cases.² They range from the first century B. C., but afford nothing striking.

The epigram attributed to Sophokles by Athenaios, 604 F, is doubtful both in form and authorship. See Crus. Soph. [3], p. 125.

Plutarch, Aem. Paul. 15 is followed by a regular distich and therefore does not belong here.

The form, four hexameters followed by one pentameter, is represented by one case in Greek, K. 708, and one in Latin, B. 1329.

Five hexameters + one pentameter is found only in K. 614 (CIG. 6260), an excellent and characteristic epitaph from Rome belonging to the second century.

Six hexameters + one pentameter is found in B. 1088 (very bad), K. 610 and Gregory Naz. (epitaph), *Anth. Pal.* VIII 29 (Migne, *Patr. Graeca*, XXXVIII, p. 49, no. 70). K. 609 is the only case of seven hexameters + one pentameter.

Further combinations of hexameters and pentameters sufficiently regular to imply design are all late and from the Greek. Such are:

Two hex. + two pentam., K. 278. Three hex. + three pentam., K. 933 (240 A. D.).

The considerable number of irregular forms still remaining are

¹ On the famous epigram of the fifth century B. C. quoted by Plutarch, *Arist.* 19, as two hexameters and a pentameter, but in *Mor.* 873 B, and in other authors as two regular distichs, see Preger, p. 65; Crusius, Simonid. [126], p. 259.

² Kaibel, 156, 309, 316, 356, 357, 598, 683, 844, 850, 909.

not taken up here because, although their ultimate origin may be explained by a theory like that propounded by Usener, they do not, in themselves, display any deliberate plan of composition and, consequently, are repeated only by accident.¹

To sum up, then, what seem to me to be the results of our investigation :

In the extant literature there is no such thing as the so-called 'dramatic pentameter.' These lines have every appearance of being pairs of dactylic tripodies catalectic, so constructed and known to be such by the poets themselves. The reappearance of these old-fashioned verses in Euripides is perhaps one of the marks of the influence of Aischylos upon him. The recognition of their real nature effectually disposes of some exceptional usage hitherto considered by some metricians under the head of the regular pentameter. In so far, then, the discussion of the regular pentameter has been considerably simplified. The pentameter clings closely to the hexameter. It is rarely found in the company of other verses, never unless chaperoned, so to speak, by the hexameter. The one exception is an epitaph of the Macedonian period which was plainly constructed *ad hoc* and in which the poet chose a verse as near the hexameter as the improper name of his subject would allow.

The pentameter as a monostich did not derive from a theory that the verse might be cut out of the distich and used by itself. It is due to an inevitable but false analogy with verses which it closely resembled and from which, in fact, the elegiac pentameter had originally sprung, the double dactylic tripod catalectic. It was not until it had usurped and thereby inherited the use of these verses in the contracted sphere in which they had moved from a remote antiquity that the right of the pentameter to be used as a monostich was established. It is impossible to say when this confusion took place. In fact it is a question whether it ever did altogether take place. The idea that these verses are really pentameters is more modern than ancient. At any rate, down to

¹ So, too, the combination of the distich with other verses was not taken up in this investigation, since no such combination may be called a form of the distich itself, either regular or irregular. Perhaps the most frequent and interesting of these combinations are those with the iambic trimeter. Compare, for example, Anthol. Pal. XIII 13; Simonides, 106 (Cr., p. 256); Krinagoras, Anthol. Pal. IX 239; Diog. Laert. IV 2, 12 (AP, VII 102); Greg. Naz. AP. VIII 85.

the very end of antiquity, the pentameter as a monostich has a definite and continuous tradition of artistic use. Not once in all that time does it occur outside its inherited sphere of *ex-votis*, proverbs, old said sooth and the like.

The pentameter *κατὰ στίχον* is also old. It may be due—though this is by no means as clear—to a similar false analogy and consequent usurpation of the tripod used in a series. This use of the tripod is rare. So is the pentameter *κατὰ στίχον*. But although the pentameter *κατὰ στίχον*—with special variations—rose to the height of literary use, it never held nor deserved the position of the single pentameter, and at the end of all things ran off and out into a so-called *πεντάμετρον ἐπικόν*. The one really artistic example of it is the epigram of Philippos (AP. 13, 1). That this should be a *dedicatio* in intent is also significant.

The deliberate reversal of the distich is associated with the name of Dionysios Chalkus, but apparently his experiment went no further than the merely mechanical interchange of hexameter and pentameter. He does not seem to have had the discernment even to realize that, for example, the system of pauses usual in the distich should have been reversed as well as the order of the lines if any notable effect was to be produced. It is probable that, like Yvon in the old fairy tale, "this trick never came out of his own head." We have one oracle of two lines in this form. If such were his source he misunderstood the evidence. The oracle regarding Phalaris, for example, if genuine is not a deliberate case of the distich reversed. Oracles are not delivered in distichs at all. Such cases as Apuleius, Met. IV 33, Heliod. Aethiop. II 26, II 35, are purely literary. Indeed the oracle regarding Phalaris may well be of the same sort, merely part of a story which certainly smacks of later days and was designed by its form to suggest the irregularities of ancient folk verse. The idea underlying the other forms discussed is clear enough.

In every case, irregular forms of the distich are either confined to, or clearly derived from, the inscriptional sphere. This is due to the extreme antiquity of the sphere, to the conservatism of tradition, the variety of talent necessarily found there and the shape and limitations of the object inscribed. In a large number of cases the form is the result of mere juxtaposition of favorite sentiments and is, therefore, irregular only in appearance. There were a great many examples of these irregular forms. The frequency of inscriptions, their intimate connection with every

phase of public and private life is one of the most characteristic features of the ancient world as compared with our own. In the time of Sulla, for example, many travellers and investigators had already collected and published them in large numbers. These collections are now lost but must be reckoned with by those who would study the sources of Pausanias, the Greek Anthology, etc.

To select a frequent and characteristic peculiarity and constitute it a canon of literary art within the department in which it was found seems an easy and natural step, especially for the Greeks, with whom literary traditions were conservative and genetic and the distinctive, inherited peculiarities of department so carefully observed. When the epigram developed from its original office of a practical *inscriptio* into a regular branch of literature it dropped all its irregularities as a matter of course. But the original department went on as before, and if the poet returned to it he recognized the freedom of form as a departmental peculiarity and adopted it while moving in that department. The artistic limitations of the freedom which he allowed himself are clearly marked by the examples which we have been considering. The irregular forms of the distich which rose to literary rank, one and all, have a certain symmetry and betray a deliberate theory of composition. This is why they were selected for literary purposes in distinction from the rest, and down to the latest period their original sphere was rarely, if ever, forgotten or transgressed.

Finally, when we contrast the Greek and Roman treatment of these forms the difference is characteristic and national. Rome speaks in the mouth of Petronius. With her imperious temper, her passion for the exact, the fact that with her the distich began as a scholastic tradition, not as a national growth, we should naturally expect her to relegate all infringements of the one proper form to the obscurity which, in her opinion, they deserved.

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

IV.—INDIAN GLOSSES IN THE LEXICON OF HESYCHIOS.

The Greek lexicon of Hesychios contains, as is well known, a number of glosses from the Indo-Iranian dialects. The Persian words found in this Alexandrine lexicographer have been fully discussed by Lagarde in his treatise on 'Die persischen Glossen der Alten' (Gesammelte Abhandlungen, 147-242), but the Indian vocabulary of the Hesychian thesaurus has as yet received little attention. It is true that Reland, in his discussion 'De veteri lingua Indica' (Diss. VI of his Diss. Misc. I 207-32), has devoted considerable space to the Indian glosses of Hesychios. Reland, however, does not seem to have been acquainted with Sanskrit, for he etymologized the Indian words on the theory that they were of Persian origin. This view of Reland's, however natural two centuries ago when he wrote, fatally vitiates his results. The Indian words found in the Greek and Latin authors imperatively demand study anew. Such an investigation should possess some value as casting additional light upon the current pronunciation of the Sanskrit and Prākṛit during the period when India was known to the Graeco-Roman world. The present paper, however, is confined to the Indian glosses in Hesychios. These glosses are arranged here in their alphabetic order. For the sake of brevity, remarks on the words considered are confined to the smallest space consistent with clearness. The identifications suggested for some of the glosses must be regarded as merely tentative. Notwithstanding this, they are advanced in the hope that, if they themselves are incorrect, they may nevertheless furnish some clue for a future investigator.

ἀποκολοκαύτωσις· παρ' Ἰνδοῖς ἡ συνουσία. οἱ δὲ π^ε παφλαγόσι τινῶν χρησμένων τὰ αἰδοῖα δονεῖν παρέχει.

The Indian word ἀποκολοκαύτωσις seems to be derived from Skt. *aṣa + kāla + √ kḥud*. The meaning would then be συνουσία παρὰ χρόνον. The exact mode of συνουσία is not easy to determine. Two passages of the Kāmasūtra may perhaps be cited as throwing some light upon this gloss. Of these two the second seems to be the one to be preferred as an explanation of the word.

The first passage is as follows: *saṃvāhanē pariṣvajamānēva gātrāir ūrūnāyakasya mṛdñyāt | prasṛtaparicayā cōrumūlam sajaghanam iti saṃsprśēt | tatra sthīraliṅgatām upalabhya cāsya pāṇimanthēna parighaṭṭayēt | cāpalam asya kutsayantīva hasēt ||* (Kāmasūtra, ed. Durgaprasada, Nirṇaya Sāgara Press, p. 166; see R. Schmidt's translation, p. 206).

The second, and apparently the preferable, passage runs thus: *ēvaṃ vṛkṣajānām jantūnām śūkāir upalīptam liṅgam daśarātram tāilēna mṛditam punaḥpunar upalīptam punaḥ pramṛditam iti jātaśōpham khaṭvāyām adhōmukhas tadantarē lambayēt | tataḥ śītāiḥ kaṣāyāiḥ kṛtavēdanānigraham sōpakramēṇa niṣpādayēt | sa yāvajjīvam śūkajō nāma śōphō viṭānām ||* (Kāmasūtra, p. 369; see Schmidt, p. 471).

If the explanation of the gloss ἀποκολοκαύτωσις here suggested be correct, it would show that the Sanskrit *√ khud*, which occurs but seldom in the literature, was used more frequently in popular speech than is generally supposed. In the Kāmasūtra *kāla* is frequently used in the sense of χρόνος συνουσίας (e. g. pp. 76, 101 of the Nirṇaya Sāgara Press edition).

[It is possible that π^ε παφλαγόσι may be from φλέγω in the sense of *amore urere*.—M. S., Jr.]

[Professor Lanman, private letter of Nov. 15, 1900, suggests that ἀποκολοκαύτωσις may be 'a Greek name for an Indian method' (cf. the discussion on περυνγούραννος). In this case ἀποκολοκαύτωσις might be miswritten, as he says, for ἀποκολοκύντωσις. A possible explanation of the phrase *vṛkṣajānām jantūnām śūkāir upalīptam liṅgam* Kāmasūtra, p. 166, may thus be gained. The gloss is beset with difficulties. The whole appearance of the word is Greek, not Indian, and the termination can be nothing but Greek. Our suggested explanation of the gloss, assuming it to be Indian, as συνουσία παρὰ χρόνον (*apa* 'away' + *kāla* 'time' + *√ khud* 'fuit') is very doubtful and it must be considered as merely tentative.]

βαισῆνης* παρ' Ἰνδοῖς τὸ στρατόπεδον (cf. also βαίσηνος* ὁ στρατός).

It is possible that βαισῆνης may be the representative of the Sanskrit *abhiṣēṇa*, which occurs in RV. 6, 44, 17, where it is thus glossed by Sāyaṇa: *asmān pratyabhiḡatāḥ sēnā yēṣām tādr'sān* (cf. AK. ii 8, 94: *yat sēnayā 'bhigamanam arāu tad abhiṣēṇanam*). The meaning of *abhiṣēṇa* would thus be 'a hostile advancing force' (hardly, as the PWb. says, 'Geschosse richtend'), which answers fairly well to the signification assigned by Hesychios to

βαισῆνης. As a reverse analogy to the loss of initial Sanskrit *a* in a Greek loan-word, we may cite Greek ἐπανάφορά 'repetition,' which is borrowed in Sanskrit in the form *paṇaphara* 'astrological term. tech.' (Uhlenbeck, Etymol. Wtb. 153). [Prof. Lanman, private letter, Aug. 18, 1900, queries whether βαισῆνης is not Prāk. *paṣṣēnā* from *paṣṣisēnā*, Skt. *pratisēnā* 'hostile army,' Harivaṃśa 6018. For the phonology involved see Hēmacandra Prāk. Gramm., ed. Pischel, I 206; Pischel, Gramm. der Prākṛit-Sprachen, §220.]

βραχμᾶνες* οἱ παρ' Ἰνδοῖς γυμνοσοφισταὶ καλούμενοι.

This gloss is plainly the Skt. *brahmāṇaḥ* 'Brahmans.'

γάνδαρος* ὁ ταυροκράτης παρ' Ἰνδοῖς.

The word γάνδαρος is evidently the Skt. *gandharva*, Māhār. Prāk. *gandhavva* 'a semi-divine being.' The Greek transcription would seem to presuppose a Prāk. **gandharra*. (Reland, I 221, derived γάνδαρος from the Persian *kundāvar* 'bold champion.')

γανσαλίτης* ὄρνειον παρὰ Ἰνδοῖς.

It is barely possible that γανσαλίτης may be a Greek recollection of the Skt. *kāūsika* 'owl.' But this identification is by no means certain. [Professor Lanman, private letter of Aug. 11, 1900, suggests that γανσαλίτης stands for Skt. *kāusala* 'a Kosala (bird)'; cf. Skt. *sāindhava* 'Sindhi (horse).'] The phonology and the semantics are so excellent that it is far preferable to the identification with *kāūsika*. At the same time, I have not yet met with any substantiation of the meaning 'bird' in the Sanskrit lexicographers. The only signification which I have thus far found for *kāusala* beside being a proper name is 'bow'; cf. *kāusalam gāṇḍivō*, Vāijayanti, p. 118, l. 347, ed. Oppert. Reland, I 222-3, derived γανσαλίτης from the Persian *kajalah* 'magpie.'—L. H. G.]

Γεννοί* οἱ γυμνοσοφισταί.

M. Schmidt, in his edition of Hesychios, correctly recognized in this gloss the Skt. word *jāina* 'Jain.' This form Γεννοί shows Prākṛitic influence in the doubling of an original single consonant, with resultant shortening of the Sanskrit diphthong *āi* to *i*, *ē* (cf. also *jina* in Mahāvastu, passim, and Māhār. *jīṇa*).

Δορσάνης* ὁ Ἑρακλῆς παρ' Ἰνδοῖς.

With the gloss Δορσάνης we may perhaps compare the Sanskrit

dhr̥ṣṇuka 'bold,' the name of a prince in the Harivaṃśa. The Iranian *Daršīnika*, the name of an enemy of Vištāspa (Yt. 9. 30; 17. 50), may also be quoted (Justi, Iran. Namenb. 80). Some suspicion is cast upon the accuracy of Δορσάνης as a transcription of a Sanskrit word by the fact that the gloss is alphabetized by Hesychios between δορχελοί and Δοσάδης, so that the form Δορσάνης has been evidently corrupted in the manuscripts of the lexicon. (Reland, I 221, supposed that Δορσάνης was the Persian Rustam.)

εὐάν· ὁ κισσὸς ὑπὸ Ἰνδῶν.

The identification of the Indian word of which εὐάν is the Greek transcription is very uncertain. It is barely possible that εὐάν is to be referred to the Sanskrit *vayā* 'creeper.' The exact Indian form would accordingly be **vayāna*, Prāk. **va(y)āṇa*. For a similar case in which the existence of a *-na*-derivative (Lindner, Altind. Nominalbild. 136) is to be inferred from a Greek lexicographer, although the Sanskrit word with the termination *-na* is not found, we may compare the sole Indian gloss of the Etymologicum Magnum, ed. Gaisford, 259, 32; 277, 38: κατὰ δὲ τὴν Ἰνδῶν φωνὴν δεῦνος ὁ βασιλεὺς λέγεται. In the citation before us it is evident that δεῦνος stands for *dēvana* (cf. Skt. *dēva* in the sense of 'my lord, the king'). The Viṣṇu Purāṇa 422 has the proper name *dēvanakṣatra* as a variant reading for *dēvakṣatra*. (Reland, 219-20, derives δεῦνος, which he thinks may be Malay instead of Indian, from the Persian *tuān* 'able, powerful'.)

κάγκαμον· παρ' Ἰνδοῖς ξύλον δάκρυον, καὶ θυμίαμα.

Uhlenbeck (Etymol. Wtb. 56) rightly identifies κάγκαμον with the Sanskrit *kuṅkuma* 'saffron,' which is a loan-word from the Semitic. (Reland's reading, I 214, κάγκαλον and his derivation of the word from the Persian *kankar* 'herba quadam spinosa, unde resina mastiches instar paratur' is, of course, untenable.)

μαί· μέγα, Ἰνδοί.

The gloss μαί evidently represents the Sanskrit adverb *mahi* 'greatly, very much.' (Reland, I 223, connected μαί with the Persian *mih* 'great'.)

μαίσωλος· ζῶον τετράπουν, γενόμενον ἐν τῇ Ἰνδικῇ, ὅμοιον μόσχῳ.

The gloss μαίσωλος is to be connected with the Sanskrit *mēṣa* 'ram.' This presupposes the existence of a Sanskrit **mēṣala* (cf. Lindner, Altind. Nominalb. 145), Prāk. **mēsala*.

μαμάτραι· οἱ στρατηγοί, παρ' Ἰνδοῖς.

The word μαμάτραι probably corresponds to the rare Sanskrit *marmatra* 'breastplate' (according to PWb. sub voc.), which might also mean 'general' (i. e. 'protector of the vital parts'), if one is to insist on the accuracy of the definition given by Hesychios. The Prakrit form of Skt. *marmatra* should be **mammatta* or **māmatta*. If the identification here suggested be correct, the Greek gloss presents a curious combination of a Prakritized stem with a pure Sanskrit formative suffix.

μορσική· ἡ Ἰνδική.

M. Schmidt in his edition of Hesychios already saw that this gloss is to be considered a derivative of the following word, Μωριεῖς.

Μωριεῖς· οἱ τῶν Ἰνδῶν βασιλεῖς.

The gloss Μωριεῖς represents the Sanskrit dynastic name *māurya*. Owing to the prominence of this royal house in Magadha, and owing more immediately to their close contact with the Greek invaders under Alexander, their name seems to have become synonymous to the Hellenes with 'king.' The transcription of Sanskrit *āu* by ω points to the Prakrit change to *ō* of the Sanskrit *āu*; cf. Prak. *mōriyaputta*, Sthavirāvalī I in Jacobi's edition of the Kalpasūtra, p. 77. (Reland's view, I 224-5, concerning the gloss Μωριεῖς is very unclear and it is no longer tenable.)

περυγοτύραννος· ὄρνις ποῖός ἐν Ἰνδικῇ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ δοθεῖς.

It is evident that the Greek word περυγοτύραννος as an Indian gloss is a translation of some Sanskrit word. The exact Indian term in question is not certain. The Sanskrit *paṅśirāj(an)* 'bird-king,' which is used as an epithet of Garuḍa and Jaṭāyu, may be suggested (cf. also *paṅśisvāmin garuḍa*, Hitōpadēśa, II 12). Perhaps this 'king of birds' may have been the peacock, which became known in Greece by importation from India. The peacock was a royal pet in India, and it was much admired and securely protected by Alexander the Great during his invasion of the country (McCrindle, *Invasion of India by Alexander the Great*, 362-3 [but see also 186, note 3; 189, note 1]; Reland, I 231-2). It is barely possible that the parrot may be meant by Hesychios in this gloss, instead of the peacock. According to the Pseudo-Kallisthenes, III 18, Queen Kandake, who ruled the country of her great-grandmother Semiramis (i. e. Persia), sent

Alexander, among other presents, six parrots. The location of the country under Kandake's sway is very uncertain in the Pseudo-Kallisthenes (see also Valerius Maximus, III 28 seqq.; History of Alexander the Great, tr. Budge, 117 seqq.; Spiegel, *Erän. Alterthumsk.* II 590). Kandake was the throne-name of the queens of Ethiopia (cf. Acts viii. 27), but the Pseudo-Kallisthenes seems to regard her as ruler of Persia, although she speaks of 'our India.' At any rate, some such legend as that told by the Pseudo-Kallisthenes may have been in the mind of Hesychios when he wrote of 'a certain bird given to Alexander in India.' No such epithet as 'king of birds' seems to have been applied by the Ancient Indian poets either to the peacock or to the parrot, although both birds are still sacred in Northern India (Crooke, *Popular Religion and Folk-Lore of Northern India*, II 250-2). On the Greek knowledge of birds in India see Lassen, *Ind. Alterthumsk.* III 319-22. An Iranian parallel, in which an Avestan word not found in the extant texts is translated into Greek by Hesychios, is: *δωροφορικὴ ἐσθῆς οὕτω λέγεται, ἣν βασιλεὺς Περσῶν δωρεῖται*. In this gloss *δωροφορικὴ* evidently is the equivalent of the Iranian **dāθrabāra* 'gift-bearing.' A personal friend very kindly cites as English parallels for Indian compound words imitatively translated into another language the terms Poison People 'serpents,' Red Flower 'fire,' Hunger Dance, and Man Pack from Kipling's *Jungle Book*.

σάκταρον· τοῦτο ἐμφερές ἐστι κόμμει, γεννώμενον ἐν τῇ Ἰνδικῇ, διαλυτικόν.

The gloss has been correctly explained by Uhlenbeck, *Etym. Wtb.* 305, s. v. *śarkarā*: "gr. *σάκχαρ*, *σάκχαρον* zucker ist aus pāli *sakkharā* entlehnt." (Kruse, *Indiens alte Geschichte*, p. 402, Leipzig, 1856, reads *κοιλίας λυτικόν* instead of *διαλυτικόν*. M. Schmidt, like Kruse, in his *editio maior* of Hesychios says rightly that *σάκταρον* stands for *σάκχαρον*.)

σάμμα· ὄργανον μουσικόν παρὰ Ἰνδοῖς.

The word *σάμμα* is undoubtedly the Sanskrit *sāman* 'song.' This gloss, like the preceding one, shows Prākritic influence in the doubling of a consonant with resulting correction of a preceding long vowel (Prāk. **samma*). The meaning attached to *σάμμα* by Hesychios is hardly to be pressed too closely. (Reland, I 228, derived *σάμμα* from the Persian *šamāmah* 'fistula inaequalibus calamis compacta.' This etymology is, of course, quite untenable.)

The Indian glosses in Hesychios seem to be derived both from Sanskrit and from Prakrit, since the words γάνδαρος, Γεννοί, μαμάτραι, Μωριείς, σάκχαρον, σάμμα, and probably βαισήνης, are plainly Middle Indian forms. On the other hand, ἀποκολοκαύτωσις, βραχμᾶνες, Δορσάνης, and probably γανσαλίτης and εὐάν, seem to represent Sanskrit forms. Whether κάγκαμον, μαί, and μαίσωλος are to be referred to Sanskrit or to Prakrit cannot be determined. In this respect the Hesychian lexicon differs from the Indian words found in the great India of al-Birūnī. The famous Persian traveller endeavored to transcribe Sanskrit words into Arabic script, but he did not record Prakritisms (Sachau, *Indo-arabische Studien*, 5-6: "Die betreffenden Wörter sind ihm (al-B.) ohne Zweifel aus Büchern vorgelesen worden. . . . Die dictirenden Pandits haben das Sanskrit nachlässig ausgesprochen und standen hierin unter dem Einfluss der indischen Umgangssprache ihrer Zeit und Umgebung"). The Greek transcription of the Indian words in the Hesychian lexicon is in general very accurate. The principal deviations from exact transcription (so far as the Greek alphabet was able to reproduce faithfully the Indian sounds) are as follows.

a. Vowels.—Indian *ā* is represented by *o* in ἀποκολοκαύτωσις. Indian *i* is represented by *ai* in βαισήνης (?), but *ai* also stands for Sanskrit *ē* in μαίσωλος. The representation of Sanskrit *u* by *a* in κάγκαμον is probably due to the influence of the following gutturals. Sanskrit *r* is represented by *op* in Δορσάνης. Sanskrit *āi*, *āu* are represented by *ε*, *ω* (Prakritisms), respectively, in Γεννοί and Μωριείς. The prothetic *ε* in εὐάν = **ε*ῤάν should be noted. In this latter word analogy with εὐ- has perhaps been at work.

b. Consonants.—Possibly *k* is represented by *γ* in γανσαλίτης, although such a change of initial *k* to *g* is extremely rare in Prakrit (Gray, *Indo-Iran. Phonol.*, §120). Sanskrit *j* is represented by *γ* in Γεννοί. Sanskrit *ṣ* is represented, of course, by *σ* as in Δορσάνης, μαίσωλος (possibly *ś* also is represented by *σ* in γανσαλίτης). Sanskrit *h* is transcribed by *χ* in βραχμᾶνες, but between vowels it is not represented by Hesychios, for we have μαί, not *μαί. The Sanskrit mediae aspiratae are represented, as we should expect, by the Greek mediae, in βαισήνης (?), γάνδαρος, Δορσάνης. The tenuis aspirata *kh* is represented by *κ* in ἀποκολοκαύτωσις, but *kek* is transcribed by *κχ* in σάκχαρον.

On the lexicographical side the Hesychian glosses are not altogether valueless. The rare Sanskrit root *khud* 'fuit' seems

to be found in ἀποκολοκαίτωσις, and the very uncommon Sanskrit *abhiṣṇā* 'having a hostile army' or *pratisṇā* 'hostile army' in βαισῆνης, as well as the almost unknown *marmatra* 'protector of the vital parts' in μαμάτραι. The existence of a form **vayāna* 'creeping plant' beside *vayā* may possibly be inferred from the gloss εὐάν.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, PRINCETON, N. J.
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY, NEW YORK CITY.

LOUIS H. GRAY.
MONTGOMERY SCHUYLER, JR.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

Thesaurus Linguae Latinae Editus Auctoritate et Consilio Academicarum Quinque Germanicarum Berolinensis Gottingensis Lipsiensis Monacensis Vindobonensis. Vol. I, Fasc. I. Leipzig, Teubner, 1900. 7 marks.

It was inevitable that the laudatory epithets commonly affected by literary criticism in these days of systematic over-valuation should become as empty and colorless as the books which they ought never to have been forced to describe. But classical scholars may take pride in the thought that the much abused 'monumental' resumes all its proper value and significance in being applied to this great work of their department. The title itself, in its severe classical simplicity, indeed, in its very typography, has every right to suggest prototypes in marble and bronze. It is inscribed on a work truly monumental whether we consider its growth, proportions, importance or permanence. Nor do I now recall any single achievement of scholarship so utterly beyond the possibility of accomplishment by any one man and, at the same time, so distinctly and literally the work of a nation.

The *Thesaurus* was dreamed of, even cast in outline, by Friedrich August Wolf in the closing hours of the eighteenth century. One hundred years later, in the closing hours of the nineteenth century his dream begins to assume reality in the first section of a work which had already lingered for nearly half a generation in the sphere of the more vivid future. An account¹ of Wolf's plans and views was published in 1820, four years before his death. If their realization then would have prevented their realization now, we may be thankful that he met the usual disappointment of those whose ideas are so far in advance of their time. Comparative philology, historical grammar and syntax, scientific criticism of texts, epigraphy—all that makes the foundation and value of a great thesaurus as we understand it—were in their infancy. Thousands of inscriptions were yet to see the light, the riddle of Plautus was yet to be solved, critical editions did not exist. But, although it bore no fruit at the time, the great idea of the founder of modern scholarship was never forgotten, and with the rapid advance of philology the need of its realization became more and more urgent.

¹ See his *Kleine Schriften* II, p. 1192 f.

The second attempt¹ came when Maximilian II of Bavaria offered ten thousand gulden to defray the expenses of such a publication. Karl Halm of Munich then invited Ritschl of Bonn and Fleckeisen of Frankfort to join with him in a committee of arrangements. Buecheler, whose ability and scholarship were supplemented by youth—an indispensable qualification for a task which could not be finished in less than twenty years—was selected as the future editor. The committee met at Bonn to discuss and mature their plans on the first of April, 1857. Unfortunately, the traditional associations with that particular day of April were ominous of the fate of those plans in the immediate future. The next year Halm embodied the matter in a paper read before the Philological Association in Vienna.² The character and scope of the work as he then presented them were, in the main, those which are now adopted. The plan was received with marked approval, competent scholars rapidly presented themselves as co-workers, in many cases, even the business arrangements with Teubner had been made for the complete lexicons of single authors. These were the necessary preliminary and foundation of a thesaurus, as Wolf himself had pointed out sixty years before. But unexpected difficulties encountered by the committee were followed by political complications. The approaching war with Italy forced Maximilian to withdraw the promised financial support, and the projected work had to be abandoned. Again it was well. Migne's *Patrologia* would have been the basis of Christian Latinity, the corpus of inscriptions had not been begun, the Latin glossaries were not available, and how many really critical texts of even the standard Latin authors can be dated prior to 1860?

The third, and finally successful, struggle for the Thesaurus did not begin until 1882, the year that von Woelfflin succeeded Halm and Halm's ambitions at Munich. In that year Professor Woelfflin published his *Aufgaben der lateinischen Lexikographie* (*Rhein. Mus.* 37, 83-123). Its immediate result in the fall of 1883 was the first number of his *Archiv für lateinische Lexikographie und Grammatik mit Einschluss des älteren Mittellateins*, als Vorarbeit zu einem Thesaurus Linguae Latinae mit Unterstützung der k. bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften herausgegeben. This well-known journal has had the greatest influence in promoting and crystallizing the plan of the Thesaurus as now adopted.

It was felt to begin with³ that as a private enterprise the Thesaurus was an impossibility. It also became clear that the combined financial resources available to the Berlin and Munich

¹ M. Hertz, *Verhand. der Philologenversammlung zu Görlitz*, vol. 40 (1889), p. 1 f.; *Ber. Berl. Akad.* 1891, p. 671 f.; Woelfflin, *Arch.* 1, 2; 2, 485; 7, 509; Heerdegen, *Lat. Lex.*,³ p. 520 (*Müller's Hdb.*, vol. 2).

² *Verhand. der Philologenvers.* 18 (1859), p. 6; Heerdegen, l. c.

³ See Woelfflin, *Archiv* 7, 507.

academies would be insufficient. Finally, in 1889, Martin Hertz, in his opening address before the Philological Association at Görlitz¹ suggested the plan of enlisting in the enterprise not only the three great academies of Berlin, Munich, and Vienna, but also other learned societies. It seems to have been partly in consequence of Hertz's suggestions that the Prussian minister of education held a conference at Berlin on the 15th of February, 1891, to which Hertz, Mommsen, Vahlen, and Diels were invited. It was the general impression then that the Prussian government would supply the necessary means and Hertz was delegated to prepare a memorial of the significance, history, organization, and probable expense, of the Thesaurus. His results were presented after consultation with Buecheler, Dziatzko, von Hartel, H. Keil, C. F. W. Müller, von Woelfflin and Teubner. They appeared in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Berlin Academy, 1891, p. 671 f. and form an important document in the case.

The next two years were spent in discussion and preparation. Late in 1893 a plan based upon the outline presented to the committee by Professors Buecheler and Woelfflin was finally agreed upon. It was estimated that the Thesaurus would be completed in twenty years. Of this period, five to seven years had to be set aside for the collection of material, before an article could be written or a line published. The net expense, reckoned at about five hundred thousand marks, was assumed by the five great learned academies of Berlin, Göttingen, Leipzig, Munich, and Vienna. These are represented by a joint committee of management and supervision, consisting of Diels, von Wilamowitz, Leo, Ribbeck—and after Ribbeck's death in 1898, Brugmann—von Woelfflin, von Hartel, and afterwards, by co-optation, Buecheler. The last details were settled at the Göttingen conference of 1894, and in July of the same year the actual collection of material began.

The so-called Meusel system was the one adopted. A slip containing ten to fourteen lines of text was mechanically reproduced as many times as there were words in the passage. In number one, the first word was underlined, in number two, the second, and so on. When the entire text was exhausted the slips were arranged alphabetically in drawers and the result was a complete *index verborum et locorum* of the author. Moreover, not only the best texts were used, but all texts were revised and, whenever necessary, were furnished with brief marginal annotations by competent authorities.

In this way was compiled a complete index of all Latinity, including inscriptions, down to the Antonines. From that period until the seventh century, which is about the time when the oral tradition of cultivated Latin was finally broken,² only certain authors, for example, Apuleius, Commodianus, the Vulgate, and part of Tertullian, have a complete index. To these should be

¹ *Verhandl. der Philologenvers.*, vol. 40, p. 1.

² *Gröber, Archiv*, I, p. 35 f.

added all the poetical inscriptions and the Latin glossaries published by Loewe and Goetz. Others, for example, Ammianus Marcellinus, have a complete index of words but not of instances. The remainder were "excerpiert," that is, examined by the most competent authorities and an index made of whatever, in their best judgment, would be of any value for lexical purposes. Not only usage but, which is equally important, non-usage, was noted. The committee was, of course, the first to acknowledge that contraction to "excerpts," even for the latest period of Latinity is to be regretted. To err is human, and no human learning may foresee which words can become all-important in some future investigation. But time as well as money have their limitations. Finally, some "excerpts" were made from the usage of scholastic Latin in modern times.

Enthusiasm, industry, and an excellent organization made it possible to complete this stage of the great task in the fall of 1899, within six months of the estimated minimum of time. The two centres of storage and arrangement had been Göttingen and Munich, but it now became clear that, as long as the material was divided, the purpose of it would, in large measure, be defeated. The Göttingen half was therefore transported to Munich and the whole placed in the "Bureau of the Thesaurus," four rooms in the third story of the Munich Academy. The slips, of which there are more than four and a half millions, are arranged alphabetically by authors. The authors are arranged in chronological order. Three thousand drawers, each containing fifteen hundred slips, are required.

The second stage, compilation and publication, formally began on the first of October, 1900. The editor in chief is Dr. F. Vollmer, already known for his edition of the *Silvae* of Statius. He will devote his entire attention to the work until it is through the press. He and his associate Dr. Oscar Hey, former secretary of the managing committee, are assisted by Doctors G. Dittmann, W. Bannier, W. Otto, A. Klotz, E. Lommatsch, P. Rabbow, E. Diehl, G. Lehnert, A. von Mess, H. Oertel, K. Prinz and E. Bickel. Etymology and derivation are in the hands of R. Thurneysen and W. Schulze, Romance relations and connections, in those of W. Meyer-Lübke.

Volume I, part 1, and volume II, part 1, have already appeared¹ and others will follow regularly and as rapidly as possible. When completed, which cannot be earlier than 1915, the work will consist of one hundred and twenty-five of these parts, forming altogether twelve volumes of about a thousand pages each.²

¹ It was decided to publish the volumes in pairs in order to avoid the delay otherwise certain to be caused by the length and difficulty of some articles as compared with others. Dr. Lommatsch, for example, had to give eight months to the compilation of *Ab.*

² The mathematically inclined may be interested to learn that, as each folio contains 83,000 letters and each part will average fifteen folios, Teubner's outlay, in the matter of type-setting alone, will have been upwards of 160,000,000 letters, by the time the Thesaurus is completed.

In the brief but sufficient introduction of two pages giving an account of the work and signed by the five academies one seems to recognize the elegant Latin of Professor Buecheler who, officially at least, is the one surviving link with the gallant attempt of 1858. Next follows an alphabetical list of Latin authors together with the editions used and the roll of scholars who prepared them for the card-index. The text is handsomely printed in double columns and, for convenience of reference, the lines are numbered. One observes with pleasure that the articles are signed by their compilers and that the honor of the first article, *a prima littera*, was given to Professor Woelfflin.

The method of arrangement and development followed by the compilers, which is the final result of years of discussion¹ will be better understood by the quotation of a sample article than by description. Within the space at my command, perhaps the best for this purpose is Prinz's treatment (vol. 2, pp. 238 and 239) of *apiscor*.

"**apiscor**, aptus sum, apisci. [*cf. c. ind. āpnōti 'adipiscitur,' med. apayēiti 'contingit, adipiscitur,' fortasse c. apio apere. Th.*] PAVL. FEST. 11 aptus cum propria significatione intellegatur, poni tamen solet pro adeptō, sicut apisci pro adipisci. NON. 74 apisci : adipisci. 68 apisci : invenire. GLOSS. apiscitur : consequitur; apisci : adipisci; apiscendae τοῦ ἐπιτυχεῖν. Schmalz, *Zeitschr. f. d. Gymnasialw.*, 1881, p. 104. Kalb, *Juristenlatein*, p. 11 sqq. *Vox adamata Tacito, qui ea tamen nusquam usus est nisi in annalibus.* TER. Phorm. 406 apiscier sine iusta causa legitur ex Benlei coniectura pro tradita forma adipiscier.

I deponens: I proprie: ACC. trag. 436 obviam ense it (ens. id *codd.*), quem (que *codd.*) advorsum aptus alter in promptu occupat. PLAVT. Epid. 668 sine me hominem apisci. SIS. hist. 94 postero die legatos Iguvium redeuntis apiscitur. LVCR. 6, 1235 nullo cessabant tempore apisci[t] ex aliis alios avidi contagia morbi. LVCR. 5, 808 crescebant uteri terram radicibus apti. CIC. Att. 8, 14, 3 eum nescio quo penetrasse itineribus occultandi sui causa an maris apiscendi (adipiscendi *M*). **2 translate:** EPIGR. inc. Gell. 1, 24, 3 (*Plauto tribuit Gellius*) postquam est mortem aptus Plautus, Comoedia luget. TITIN. com. 2 prius quam auro privatae purpuramque aptae simus (abtesimus, subtesimus *codd.*; purpuraque ap te *Buecheler*). PACVV. trag. 168 (NON. 234 aptus pro adeptus) quod ego in acie † celeberrime obiectans vitam bellando aptus sum. PLAVT. Rud. 17 litem apisci postulant peiurio. Capt. 775 hereditatem sum aptus. TER. Haut. 693 deorum vitam apti sumus. LVCIL. 542 ut ego effugiam quod te inprimis cupere apisci intellego. 757 si id quod concupisset non aptus <foret>. CIC. leg. 1, 52 ad finem bonorum, . . . quous

¹ Heerdegen, o. c.: W. Streitberg, *Indog. Forsch.*, vol. XI, Anz., p. 272 Brugmann, id., vol. X, Anz., p. 371; Diels, *Elementum*, etc.

apiscendi causa sunt facienda omnia. SERV. SVLP. Cic. epist. 4, 5, 6 magnam ex ea re te laudem apisci (adipisci *pars codd.*). CAT. 64, 145 aliquid cupiens animus praegestit apisci. LIV. 4, 3, 7 *spes* apiscendi summi honoris (*cf.* 4, 6, 10 *ubi codd. plerique* apiscendi). 44, 25, 2 tantas apisci opes tantamque gloriam. MANIL. 3, 146 rebus apiscendis labor est. VAL. MAX. 9, 7, 3 facultas apiscendae potestatis. PLIN. nat. 35, 78 regnum apiscens. TAC. ann. 3, 31 praebuit iuveni materiem apiscendi favoris (*cf.* 3, 31. 4, 1. 4, 59. 15, 12. 15, 43). 4, 16 qui id flamonium apisceretur. 14, 27 Puteoli ius coloniae et cognomentum a Nerone apiscuntur (6, 3). PLIN. epist. 4, 6, 8 illud . . . apisci . . . arduum est. CORP. V 532, 7 civitatem Romanam apiscerentur. MARCIAN. (LEX CORN.?) dig. 48, 8, 3, 4 is cuius familia sciente eo apiscendae recipendae possessionis causa arma sumpserit . . . ex senatus consulto poena legis Corneliae punitur. VLP. dig. 24, 1, 40 apiscendae dignitatis gratia. 2, 14, 18 libertatem et hereditatem. 50, 4, 6 magistratum. IAV. dig. 41, 2, 51 possessionem (CELS. dig. 47, 2, 68. VLP. dig. 43, 2, 2 *et sic saepe apud ICT.*). *cogitatione*: LVCR. 1, 448 nec ratione animi quam quisquam possit apisci *naturam*. TAC. ann. 6, 20 scientia Chaldaeorum artis, cuius apiscendae otium apud Rhodum, magistrum Thrasillum habuit.

II *passive*: PLAUT. Trin. 367 non aetate, verum ingenio apiscitur (adipiscitur P) sapientia. FAB. MAX. hist. 8 amitti quam apisci. FANN. or. Prisc. gramm. II 380, 9 haec apiscuntur *ἐπιτυγχάνονται*.

structurae: apisci *aliquid*: *passim*; *aliquid ex aliqua re*: v. p. 239, 21 (i. e. the one example in Cic. epist. 4, 5, 6 where part of the Mss have adipiscendi); *aliquid ab aliquo*: TAC. ann. 14, 27; *alicuius rei*: TAC. ann. 6, 45 nihil abnuentem dum dominationis apisceretur. *synonyma*: adipiscor, consequor, adsequor, acquiro, comparo, *sim.* *derivata*: adipiscor, indipiscor, redipiscor.—*Prinz.*"

The method and arrangement followed here are too evident to require further comment. The reader has before him the whole history of *apiscor* in a form as complete as it is clear and concise, indeed he literally has the autobiography of *apiscor*, since the phenomena have been so disposed as to make the word tell its own story. In an article of nearly five hundred words less than a score, setting aside mere headings, textual notes, and references to modern treatises, may be said to come from the compiler himself. In a work primarily intended for scholars this admirable method of stating the actual record in its completeness, but with a studied reserve of personal comment or deduction, is directly calculated to insure the undiminished value of the Thesaurus for the longest time possible. Scholarship becomes antiquated—fortunately. But references do not—even though they may tell a different story to a different generation—and the references are all here. Interpret them 'according to your lights.' Hence, although they must blame themselves if they do not know more

Latin than we, it is certain that our great grandchildren ought to derive much profit from perusing this great work of their thorough and methodical, even if misguided, ancestors. Moreover, while in the mere matter of size, the Thesaurus is likely to be eight or ten times as large as our largest Latin-English lexicons, the difference is still further increased by the compactness insured by this method.

The unique value of the Thesaurus to students of late Latin and the Romance languages is not well illustrated by the article on *apiscor*. The word had already become archaic as early as the time of Lucretius. But if we turn, for example, to the article on *Ab* (40 columns) we shall find that under "Recentiora" Dr. Lommatsch has given two columns to late uses of his preposition; such as *ab* for *quam* with comparatives, *ab* with the accusative, with the genitive, for the genitive, with adverbs and prepositions, for *sine*, *apud*, *ex*, etc.

The matter of proper names cannot be taken up exhaustively in a Thesaurus. This really belongs to a separate work and has already been done for a definite portion of Roman life and history in the *Prosopographia Imperii Romani*. All names seem to have been considered in the Thesaurus, and with copious, but not necessarily exhaustive, references, inscriptional and otherwise. With Klebs-Dessau, Roscher's *Lexikon* and Pauly-Wissowa we hardly have a right to complain if the Thesaurus does not go over the same ground in the same way. Good examples of the method pursued in this line are Dr. Otto's articles on the names derived from *Ann*-, on Anna the goddess, and on Dido's "Sister Ann."

Nor can the Thesaurus enter into an exhaustive discussion of the 'Realien,' of the arts and sciences in all their causes and effects as regards language. It is primarily a complete record of word-usage. The student of those matters should consult special treatises or else work them out from the material before him. Here again the policy of reserve in personal comment was well chosen.

I should institute a comparison with standard lexicons, like those of Georges and Lewis and Short, if I thought it would be of any interest or value. But the Thesaurus stands on its own merits and would gain nothing, while the usefulness of these works would not be affected, since they were compiled in a different way and serve a different purpose.

All things considered, the work impresses me as a marvel of clarity, completeness and precision. Opinions may vary—theories of lexicography are many—as to whether the compilers are following the best order and method of development, or whether it might not have been better to lay more or less emphasis on this or that lexical specialty. Others—and those whose interest in the work is most intense—warn us, very properly, not to expect too much. No one should expect too

much. But it is not my purpose to discuss these points here. Whatever faults might be discovered by the most searching criticism the Thesaurus, beyond any doubt, begins by being immeasurably superior to anything which, hitherto, we could have even dared to hope for.

Objections to the Thesaurus, whatever they may be, are largely met by the fact that the four and a half millions of cards upon which it stands will be permanently preserved and available for consultation. Moreover, while it is true that time and money curtailed this part of the work in 1900, it would be quite possible, with intelligent co-operation, to fill in the missing portions of the card-catalogue, so that by 1915 the Bureau of the Thesaurus might actually have in its archives a complete index *totius Latinitatis* down to the seventh century. This might be consulted in person or, in case the scholar lived at too great a distance, by correspondence with an officer in charge who should be entitled to a reasonable fee for whatever statistics or other information he was asked to furnish. At any rate the receptacle, wherever it may be finally, of this priceless collection, must become the common temple of the modern Latin League. Here is its treasure; here, too, its oracle, like the Sibyl, but much more methodical, has inscribed her *responsa* on leaves for the perusal of every *impiger* (if not *pius*) Aeneas who would scale the walls of lofty Rome.

Organization and combination are the watch-words of the age, the unmeasured and immeasurable powers of the future. The Thesaurus is a living proof that the great idea is just as effective in the scholastic as in the industrial world. As such the Thesaurus is an earnest of what may yet be accomplished in time to come. Moreover, this superb monument, more enduring than bronze, will have been raised by and in honor of Latin scholarship at a net expense of less than one hundred and fifty thousand dollars, thirty thousand pounds. What a mere trifle for organized subscription to undertake, especially in these days when there are so many men in Europe and America who, if it came to the mere measurement of their incomes alone would have to reject as irksome, if not insufficient, that historic labor-saving device employed by Ummidius and Ali Baba. With such an outlook, may we not hope that a trifling percentage of this surplus gold may be so transmuted as to reappear—'salvum sit quod tangam'—in a similar Thesaurus of the Greek Language and Literature?

KIRBY FLOWER SMITH.

Einführung in die Papyruskunde von OTTO GRADENWITZ.
S. Hirzel, Leipzig, 1900.

Those who have followed the progress of the papyri-studies and are acquainted with the results which have been given out in rapid succession during the past decade, have not failed to recog-

nize the importance of these studies to several branches of learning. The contributions of the Greek papyri from the ancient cities of Arsinoë, Hermopolis, Oxyrhynchos, and numerous villages of the Fayûm are of exceedingly great value to historical jurisprudence and to the students of Roman law. Ancient legal sources are being rapidly augmented and supplemented in a variety of details. Some of the darkest periods in the history of legal life and institutions in the Roman provinces during the second and third centuries of the Empire are beginning to be illuminated. The possibilities are by no means beyond realization, that the works of a classical jurist may yet come to light from the wreckage of ancient Egypt. In the interpretation of the Greek papyri, philologist and jurist must co-operate. So far, the jurists have been slow to recognize the importance of these investigations to their science. Of the considerable number of distinguished papyrologists at work to-day, trained jurists form a very small minority; and as the prince of jurist-philologists, Theodore Mommsen, has expressed the wish that he had been born fifty years later in order that he might begin anew his investigations in the history of the Empire in the light of these incomparable sources, others can not afford to be indifferent to their significance. The Egyptian papyri, as is well known, fall into two main groups, literary and documentary. Of the latter, those of a strictly legal character are the more numerous and form the more important class. Of the published papyri a large part has been indictments, pleadings, court proceedings, wills, marriage certificates, bills of divorce, leases, deeds of conveyance, mortgages, and numerous other documents of public and private character. All of these are of concern not only to the Roman law, but to the Greek, and to some extent to the Egyptian law.

It may be well to indicate briefly some of the results of a legal character which have been drawn from selected Greek papyri. The assertion of Mitteis in 1892 (*Reichsrecht und Volksrecht*), that there was a unity of law throughout the entire Graeco-Macedonian Empire, can no longer be contested, as is abundantly proved by evidence from the papyri. The importance of this fact to the proper understanding and estimation of the relation of Greek and Roman law to each other is not to be undervalued. According to a statute of the Alexandrian Greeks (to mention an interesting detail), descendants of descendants (i. e. grandchildren) have no right of inheritance by representation in the event of surviving descendants of the first degree. In other words, contrary to the Justinianian law of intestate succession, *successio per stirpes* was barred, should there be surviving children of the first degree. Further, a daughter has no further claim upon the estate of an intestate father beyond the amount of her *dos*, should there be sons surviving.

In the realm of Roman law there are fundamental contributions of many kinds. To mention one of general significance, it has

always been a question how Greek subjects, after the edict of Caracalla, could construct their testaments, which by Roman law must be in the Latin language. A recently disclosed papyrus of the year 235 very conveniently reveals the fact that the obstacle presented by the Caracallan *constitutio* was removed soon afterward by Alexander Severus.

The uncertain date of Caracalla's general order, ranging hitherto from 212-217, has by the papyri been narrowed down to months in the year 212. Many institutions regarded historically as post-Constantinian because first encountered in the Theodosian Code, are by the papyri set back to the first and second centuries. This extension of horizon is of incalculable value to the legal history of the Roman Empire.

Those who wish to be led into the study of the Greek papyri from the legal side will receive this book of Prof. Gradenwitz with satisfaction. The author has limited his studies in this volume to the consideration of problems within the realm of the private law, and especially to contracts.

Apart from papyri, bronze, stone and wax-tablets have transmitted public ordinances, statutes, and legal documents. Wax-tablets and papyri form one group, of which the papyri are by far the more numerous; bronze and stone another group, these latter being used for publication, while the former were used for safekeeping. *Lex* in its broadest sense was entrusted to the more dignified and enduring bronze or stone, papyrus fulfilled the humbler task of recording the fleeting events of daily life. The legal papyri show us how the injunctions of the statutes were executed, they reveal the application of the law to the concrete case, the contest of the parties at issue, the judgment, and ensuing execution—legal snapshots, so to speak—all with great exactness and in a great abundance of examples. The expressed purpose of the author is to put before the philologist the legal, and before the jurist the philological, rudiments of the papyri-study.

The undertaking is unique in the science of papyrology, and this volume is the outcome of practical work with students in the class-room in the restoration and interpretation of selected papyri. It is worthy of note that Gradenwitz, a jurist, is during the present semester offering a course to students of all faculties in the University at Königsberg, in the interpretation of selected papyri.

The volume falls into three main parts: I. On the theory of decipherment; II. Roman and Greek contract-types; III. Characteristic elements entering into the individual transaction.

The theory of decipherment and restoration presents very little that was not known to those who possess already published collections of papyri. The author has chosen as his working-model No. 613 from the Berlin collection. The document is printed first in the original and then as restored by the process of analysis and dismemberment, as a result of the author's method of analyzing first the document in its legal aspect and then with reference

to its grammatical form. A badly mutilated document may be restored by a comparison with analogous cases, by due regard to the sequence of time entering into the legal transaction, and by the assistance derived from words of style in similar instruments. It is the second part which presents matter of a different character from previous publications.

Types of contract from Greek and Roman law have been taken, such as the Greek sale of domestic animals and slaves, the Roman sale of slaves, loans and mortgage. The comparison of Greek and Roman contracts of sale reveals a noteworthy difference between the Roman conception and that of the Greek papyri. The Roman written document proceeds, as in the primitive *mancipatio*, from the standpoint of the buyer: *emit mancipioque accipit—pro eo homine pretium eius accepisse et habere se dixit* (i. e. *is qui vendidit*).

The Greek document proceeds from the standpoint of the seller, in the form of a declaration or acknowledgment that three things have happened—that is, the seller *ὁμολογεῖ* that he has sold (*πεπρακέναι*), that he has received the price (*ἀπέχειν*), and that he stands ready to warrant undisturbed possession against eviction by a third party (*βεβαιώσσειν*).

The Roman document distinguishes between the creation of the *jus in personam* and the *jus in rem*—that is, there is a separation of obligation and ownership.

The Greek document is a declaration of the party relinquishing rights and assuming duties, and the idea of a transfer of ownership does not appear in this threefold declaration of the seller.

Of loans, the most frequently occurring type is the *χειρόγραφον*, a note of hand in the form of a statement of indebtedness addressed to the creditor. Less frequent is the *ὁμολογία* form, an instrument drawn by a notary containing a minute personal description of the debtor. It is noteworthy that in the autograph documents (*χειρόγραφα*) this description is always lacking, while in the notarial instruments (*ὁμολογίαι*) it is always present. The purport of this is to protect an illiterate person (*ἀγράμματος*) who binds himself through an instrument written by another whom he has called to his assistance, against the possibility of being presented with a note for payment which was not drawn by his order—a circumstance which might easily occur where the same name frequently occurs. Identification of the parties is attained through *signalement* giving the names of ancestors, age, physical description, scars, etc. The Greek papyri give evidence of the fact that the Greeks inclined to written documents in transactions which were usually oral among the Romans. The transactions which the Romans called *mancipatio*, the papyri show were written among the Greeks in the case of *res Mancipi* (slaves, domestic animals, and land).

It remains to speak of one important feature of this book which Prof. Gradenwitz calls a new mechanical expedient for the

restoration of mutilated papyri—that is, a ‘contrary-index’; in other words, an index of words arranged in alphabetic order reading from right to left. Since the final letters only of many words are transmitted, it happens that the process of restoration must proceed in the reverse from the usual order. Following out his idea of the value of such a contrivance, the author has added a vocabulary of some 5000 words of those found to recur most frequently in the papyri.

Viewed as a whole, this volume of Prof. Gradenwitz is exceedingly valuable as an introduction to the study of legal papyri, but we venture to predict that those who have had no legal training will find it difficult to follow the author through his discussions of the larger part of the volume.

LEIPZIG, GERMANY.

JAMES J. ROBINSON.

Outlines of the History of the English Language. By T. N. TOLLER, M. A., Professor of English in the Owens College, Manchester. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1900.

King Alfred's Version of the Consolations of Boethius. Done into Modern English, with an Introduction. By WALTER JOHN SEDGEFIELD, Litt. D., Editor of King Alfred's Old English Version of the ‘De Consolatione.’ Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, MDCCCC.

The first work, whose title is given above, is one of the Cambridge Series for Schools and Training Colleges, and it is evidently well fitted for the purpose for which it was written. It is devoted chiefly to the history of the language in its oldest period, ten of its thirteen chapters being given to the Oldest English, English before the Norman Conquest, or Anglo-Saxon, as some prefer to call it. Prof. Toller's view as to the use of this term may be seen in the last section of the tenth chapter (p. 202), and, while granting that “the term Anglo-Saxon may be of use,” he thinks that “it is not without its disadvantages,” for “it tends to obscure the continuity in the life of the language, and to give to one stage of it the character almost of a foreign speech;” so “it is certainly better to speak of Old or Oldest English.” There is now a consensus of scholars as to the use of this term, which certainly preserves the continuity, while to those who know, there is no danger of an obscuration of meaning in still referring to this period of the language as Anglo-Saxon.

The first chapter is merely introductory; the following nine chapters treat the language, with competent insight and greater fullness than is usual in such works, down to the coming of the Normans.

The sixth chapter treats the so-called Latin of the Second Period with particular fullness, and a long list of Latin words is given “that made their way into English before about the middle

of the eleventh century" (p. 79 et seqq.). Certain Old English poems and their vocabulary follow, and an investigation of the Scandinavian element is made in the eighth chapter.

The works of King Alfred and of Aelfric are next considered, and a synopsis of the grammar of Old English is given in the tenth chapter. It is doubtful, however, whether this will be well understood by those entirely ignorant of Old English. It is hard for a scholar to realize that, at this stage of instruction, such things must be treated as milk for babes, boiled down to the comprehension of young students. These chapters comprise two hundred of the less than three hundred pages of the work.

The eleventh chapter treats the Norman-French element (Anglo-Norman, or Anglo-French, as some prefer to call it), and the English from the Conquest to Chaucer inclusive. The work seems to have grown under the author's hands, with the result that the last two chapters are much compressed. The twelfth chapter, in some thirty pages, covers the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, a period that deserves a more careful and thorough treatment.

In the extract from Occleve in this chapter (p. 242) the author takes *wote* in *men wote* as plural, but it is possible that *men* here may be the indefinite, and hence *wote* is singular, although Chaucer himself has several times *ye woot*, showing that the old distinction between singular and plural forms was being disregarded. The last chapter is very meagre, only fourteen pages, and we miss all mention of Ben Jonson as a representative of "the language of the early part of the seventeenth century," but every prominent writer could not be included, even if Ben Jonson's "Discoveries" will bear mention in any treatise on the language of this period. His remark that "Spenser, in affecting the ancients, writ no language" is, however, twice quoted. We miss titles to the several chapters and an index, which would have increased the convenience of reference, and we have noted some misprints, which it seems impossible to avoid in the best-regulated printing-office. More exact references to works quoted would also have been helpful. We have, however, much to be thankful for.

Dr. Sedgefield's edition of King Alfred's Old English Version of Boethius' *De Consolatione Philosophiae* (Oxford, 1899) was briefly noticed in this Journal (Vol. XX, No. 4), and now we are indebted to him for a modern English version of the prose text, and a metrical version of the *Metra*, or Lays, of Boethius, but why it should appear as "Consolations," we are nowhere informed. The Introduction treats of King Alfred's reforms and his zeal for learning, enumerating his translations of Orosius, Bede, the Dialogues and the Pastoral Care of Pope Gregory the Great, Boethius, and the Soliloquies of St. Augustine. The editor thinks that the Orosius, Boethius, Pastoral Care, and Soliloquies

"were put into English by the King himself," the Dialogues, perhaps, by Bishop Werfrith, and the Bede, "in its original form, was also the work of one of the King's learned priests." This has been one of the mooted questions in Old English literature.

The introduction treats, further, of the work of Boethius and his fate, King Alfred's method of translation, which he has himself described for us, the MSS of the Old English version, discussed more fully in Sedgefield's edition of the Old English, the prose and the poetic version of the metres, *both* of which the editor now thinks were made by King Alfred—another disputed question,—King Alfred's own comments and additions, and lastly the later English versions of the "Consolations." This last section is a distinct addition. We know of no English version between King Alfred and Chaucer, but after Chaucer's well-known Boëce, we have a metrical version made by a certain Johannes Capellanus, i. e. John Walton, *circa* 1410, "printed for the first and only time in 1525, in *The Boke of Comfort* at the monastery of Tavistock;" one in prose made by George Colville, or Coldewel, and dedicated to Queen Mary in 1556; a partial one of the *carmina* in a variety of metres, made about 1563 by Sir Thomas Challoner; one made by no less a personage than Queen Elizabeth herself in 1593, said to be "fairly accurate and very literal;" one in *terza rima* by a certain "J. T." in 1609; a metrical version by Harry Coningsby in 1664; an anonymous one by "A Lover of Truth and Virtue" in 1674, at Oxford; and one in 1695 by Richard Lord Viscount Preston, the *Metra* in metre and the *Prosa* in prose.

Four versions are mentioned from the eighteenth century, of which, as of the preceding, short specimens are printed, one in heroic couplets by William Causton, in 1730; a second in the octosyllabic couplet by the Rev. Philip Ridpath, in 1785; a third by a Scotchman, Robert Duncan, in blank verse, in 1789; and an anonymous translation of the *Metra* in octosyllabic quatrains, with the Latin opposite, in 1792. The only translation mentioned of the nineteenth century is one by H. R. James, London, 1897. These various translations show the continued popularity of the work. Dr. Sedgefield has translated into prose the five books of the prose version, and into thirty-one Lays the *Metra*. The metre used is an imitation of the Old English alliterative line, four accents to the verse, which the present writer has long since concluded to be the best measure for the translation of Old English poetry. Success in handling this measure depends of course upon the skill of the translator, to whom should be charged any defects in attaining the ideal and not to the measure itself.

The present translation is approximately line-for-line, and, on a cursory examination, appears to be very fairly done. I hope it may induce others to give us similar translations of Old English poems.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

REPORTS.

ROMANIA, Vol. XXVIII (1899).

Janvier.

F. Lot. Nouveaux essais sur la provenance du cycle arthurien. II. La patrie des "Lais Bretons." 48 pages. "La théorie de la provenance exclusivement armoricaine des récits dits de la Table Ronde vient de faire, avec M. Brugger, une rentrée bruyante. L'auteur, reprenant la thèse de M. Zimmer, soutient particulièrement que tous les *lais* sans exception sont originaires de la Bretagne continentale. Ceux qui ont cru qu'une partie, au moins, de ces petits poèmes pouvait provenir de la Grande-Bretagne (du pays de Galles) sont dénoncés comme des gens sans cervelle et même sans moralité."

G. Raynaud. Le dit des outils de l'hôtel (ms. du Musée Condé). 12 pages. Critical edition of the text, with introduction and glossary.

Ov. Densusianu. Étymologies romanes. 9 pages.

Giacomo de Gregorio. Ultima parola sulla varia origine del Sanfratellano, Nicosiano e Piazzese. 21 pages.

C. Salvioni. Note etimologiche e lessicali. 21 pages.

Mélanges. Ad. Mussafia; G. Paris; A. Thomas; E. Trojel; S. Berger.

Comptes rendus. Wesselofsky, Quelques nouvelles versions orientales du roman d'Alexandre (J. Anitchkoff). Ph. Aug. Becker, Der Quellenwert der Storie Nerbonesi (Raymond Weeks). Remarques sur le compte rendu de Maxeiner Beiträge zur Geschichte der französischen Wörter im Mittelhochdeutschen (Theodor Maxeiner). Réponse à Maxeiner (F. Piquet). Université de Paris: Bibliothèque de la Faculté des lettres III-IV (P. Meyer).

Périodiques. Zeitschrift für rom. Phil. XXII 4, discussion of etymologies (G. Paris). Bulletin de géographie historique et descriptive, 1897 (P. Meyer).

Chronique. "Rapport de M. V.-H. Friedel sur sa mission en Espagne."

Livres annoncés sommairement. 51 titles. The historical syntax of the atonic personal pronoun in Italian, by Oliver Martin Johnston. A study of the romance of the Seven Sages, by Killis Campbell.

Avril.

A. Thomas. Variétés étymologiques. 45 pages.

G. Paris. Caradoc et le serpent. 18 pages. "Dans le numéro de novembre 1898 des *Modern Language Notes*, Miss Carrie A. Harper, de Bryn Mawr College (États-Unis), a publié un très intéressant article sur la belle histoire de Caradoc, lequel fut délivré, par le dévouement d'une femme, d'un serpent qui s'était attaché à son bras." "L'intérêt de cette étude est de montrer clairement la pénétration de thèmes purement celtiques—armoricaïns ou gallois—dans la poésie française du xii^e siècle et de faire entrevoir, par delà cette pénétration, celle de la mythologie irlandaise dans la tradition brittonique."

A. Jeanroy. Notes sur le Tournoiement des Dames. 13 pages.

P. Meyer. Trois nouveaux manuscrits des sermons français de Maurice de Sully. 24 pages. "Je désespère de jamais parvenir à dresser une liste complète des manuscrits qui nous ont conservé la totalité ou des extraits des sermons français de Maurice de Sully. Voici la quatrième fois que je reprends cette tâche toujours inachevée, et, instruit par l'expérience, je n'ose pas assurer que ce soit la dernière."

Mélanges. L. Katona; E. Teichmann; Ferdinand Lot; P. Meyer; G. Paris; J. Calmette.

Comptes rendus. Studier i modern sprakvetenskap. I. (Johan Vising). Kate Oelzner Petersen, On the sources of the Nonne Prestes Tale (Lucien Foulet). Catálogo de la Real Biblioteca—Manuscritos: Crónicas de España descritas por Ramon Menéndez Pidal (Alfred Morel-Fatio). Vierter Jahresbericht des Instituts für rumänische Sprache zu Leipzig (Mario Roques). Gustav Weigand, Samosch- und Theiss-Dialekte (Mario Roques). Gustav Weigand, Linguistischer Atlas des dacorumänischen Sprachgebietes (Mario Roques). Bibliografia românească veche, 1508–1830 (Mario Roques). Studii de filologie română (Mario Roques).

Chronique. Death of Dr. Wilhelm Rüdow.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 8 titres. Hermann Piatt, Neuter II in Old French.

Juillet.

F. Lot. Nouvelles études sur la provenance du cycle arthurien. III. Morgue la Fée et Morgan-Tud. IV. Melvas. V. Guillaume de Rennes, auteur des *Gesta Regum Britanniae*. VI. L'épisode des Larmes d'Énide dans Érec. VII. Le Chevalier Alban. VIII. Bledericus de Cornwall. IX. Dinas Emreys. X. La table et la chaire d'Arthur en Cornwall. 27 pages.

G. Huet. Sur l'origine de Floire et Blanche fleur. 12 pages.

"Depuis le travail d'Édéléstand du Ménil (1855), il est généralement admis que le conte de *Floire et Blanchefleur* est d'origine byzantine." "Je crois cependant qu'il y a quelque chose à dire en faveur de la thèse d'une origine orientale ou, pour parler plus nettement, *arabe*, de la légende."

S. Berger. Les bibles castillanes. Introduction. I. L'Histoire Générale d'Alphonse X. II. Traductions d'après le texte Latin: §1. Manuscrit aragonais de la première moitié de la Bible, avec les psaumes d'Herman l'Allemand; §2. Seconde moitié de la Bible; §3. Ancien Testament; §4. Versions perdues du Nouveau Testament. 49 pages.

C. Salvioni. Ancora dei Gallo-Itali di Sicilia (Replica al Signor G. de Gregorio). 12 pages.

Mélanges. A.-G. Krüger; P. Meyer; G. Paris; George Doncieux (*bis*).

Comptes rendus. Vincenzo Crescini, Il Cantare di Florio e Biancafiore (G. Paris). 9 pages. A. J. Botermans, Die hystorie van die seuen wijse mannen van Romen (G. Paris). H. P. B. Plomp, De middelnederlandsche bewerking van het gedicht van den VII vroeden van binnen Rome (G. Paris). Wilhelm Cloëtta, Die Enfcancen Vivien: ihre Ueberlieferung, ihre cyklische Stellung (Raymond Weeks).

Périodiques. Zeitschrift für rom. Phil. XXIII 1-2, discussion by A. Jeanroy and G. Paris. Revue de phil. franç. et de litt. XII, contents by P. Meyer. Bull. de la soc. des anc. textes franç. 1898. Zeitschrift für französ. Sprache und Litt. XIII-XIX.

Chronique. Death of M. Charles Marty-Laveaux.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 17 titles. Cornell University Library: Catalogue of the Dante Collection presented by Willard Fiske, Part I.

Octobre.

L. Brandin. Le manuscrit de Hanovre de la Destruction de Rome et de Fierabras. 19 pages, with double facsimile.

S. Berger. Les bibles castillanes. III. Revisions d'après l'Hébreu. IV. La Bible du Grand Maître. V. La Bible de Ferrare. (Appendice: Note sur les bibles portugaises, par Mme. C. Michaëlis de Vasconcellos et S. Berger). 60 pages.

F. Lot. Caradoc et Saint Patern. 11 pages.

J. Vising. L'Amuïssement de l'R finale en Français. 19 pages (including discussion with Herman Andersson).

J. Leite de Vasconcellos. Phonologia Mirandesa. 23 pages.

Comptes rendus. Giovanni Mari, I trattati medievali di ritmica

latina (G. Paris). E. Stengel, Die altprovenzalische Liedersammlung C der Laurenziana in Florenz (Louis Brandin). M. Pelaez, Il canzoniere provenzale C Laurenziano (Louis Brandin). Edward Moore, Studies in Dante (Paget Toynbee). 9 pages.

Périodiques. Zeitschrift für rom. Phil. XXIII 3, discussion of etymologies by G. Paris. Literaturblatt für german. und rom. Phil. XVIII-XIX, list of contents.

Chronique. Death of Eugène Kölbing. Homenaje á Menéndez Pelayo en el año vigesimo de su profesorado. K. Vollmöller, Gesellschaft für romanische Litteratur.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 21 titles. Hermann Suchier, Aucassin und Nicolette: vierte Auflage. Samuel Paul Molenaer, Li livres du Gouvernement des rois. Thomas Edward Oliver, Jacques Milet's Drama "La Destruction de Troye la Grant," its principal source, its dramatic structure. Arsène Darmesteter, A historical French grammar: authorized English edition by Alphonse Hartog. Frederick Henry Sykes, French elements in Middle English.

GEORGE C. KEIDEL.

HERMES, XXXV.

U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Asianismus und Atticismus. Modern scholars differ as to the meaning of the term Asiatic style, but they are unanimous in condemning this style as a whole. Cicero, whose judgment on this matter is incomparably the best that we can get, uses the term somewhat elastically, and though he denounces certain characteristics of this style, he does not engage in a sweeping condemnation of the *Asiatici* and the *genus Asiaticae dictionis*. Dionysius of Halicarnassus is responsible for the fact that some scholars regard the expression Asiatic as synonymous with Hellenistic, and that others look upon Asiatic oratory as identical with *corrupta eloquentia*. The later rhetoric was not a revival of the old, for from Gorgias to Philostratus there was an unbroken succession of Sophists whose influence on Roman literature was great. But their power was ephemeral, and only the classic writers were remembered, the Asiatics were forgotten. The florid style of later times was merely one of the fixed types, which an orator was obliged to follow, if he chose that mode of treatment, and the artificiality of the period made it popular. Its faults, which were Hellenistic rather than Asiatic, were the combination of musical and rhythmical elements and the use of periphrases and fine words. Atticism finally triumphed, because of the influence of the grammarian and the philosopher and the need of a lofty model for the Roman who would learn Greek.

B. Niese, Zur Geschichte des Hellenismus, constructs Achæan

chronology from Polyb. II 41-43 by beginning with the founding of the league and reckoning the fourth and eighth years as four and eight (not three and seven); dates the battle of Sellasia 222 by the authority of Polyb. IV 35 and by the death of Ptolemy III before 221; and makes Adaeus, mentioned by Damoxenus, a Thracian prince conquered by Ptolemy III.

R. Reitzenstein, *Die Hochzeit des Peleus und der Thetis*. Apollodorus takes from an early epic poem, which Aeschylus and Pindar (Isthm. VII) also followed, the oracle, the struggle with Thetis, the feast on Pelion and the gifts, and from the Cypria the wrath of Zeus and intervention of Hera. Hesiod's epithalamium (Fr. 38, 102 Rz., pap. gr. 55 of Strassburg) is the source of Pindar (Nem. V), Euripides (I. A.) and Catullus. However, the likeness of Catullus' description to Theocritus XV and the burning love of the bridal pair show that he follows more immediately an Alexandrian poem, which described also the marriage of Dionysus and Ariadne. The praise of marriage in Gregory Nazianzen (Migne III 522) belongs to a rhetorical poem of the same class and period.

E. Schwartz, *Kallisthenes Hellenika*. The denial of Athens' treaty with Persia in 449 was taken in 333 from Theopompus, who had then published 25 volumes. His error in dating the treaty in 467 (for 449) is due to Ephorus, whose account of the two expeditions is so similar that Lycurgus made them into one. This combination in the *Menexenus* proves that the dialogue is not Platonic. The latter half of the epigram in Ephorus is spurious.

C. Robert, *Die Ordnung der olympischen Spiele und die Sieger der 75.-83. Olympiade*. The *Oxyrhynchus papyri* compared with Phlegon and others show that after Ol. 78 the games lasted five days: I. 1. στάδιον. 2. δίαυλος. 3. δόλιχος. II. 4. πένταθλον. III. 5. πάλη. 6. πύξ. 7. παγκράτιον. IV. 8. παίδων στάδιον. 9. παίδων πάλη. 10. παίδων πύξ. 11. όπλίτης. V. 12. τέθριππον. 13. κέλης. In earlier times there were only three days, Nos. 4-7, 12, 13 coming on the second day, Nos. 8-11 on the third. The papyri not only complete the list of victors, but date sculptors and epinikia. Thus we learn that Pythagoras of Rhegium (b. 510) was active as late as 448, that Polycleitus worked as early as 460, his brother, Naucydes, in 448. The Xenocles statue is probably the work of the younger Polycleitus, and Daedalus the grandson of Polycleitus the elder. We can also date two statues of Myron (456 and 448). Bacch. VI and VII are set at 452, Pind. O. I-III, X, XI at 476, and IX at 468. It appears that O. IV celebrates a chariot-race, and that O. V. belongs to 448, O. XIV probably to 488.

H. Diels reads in Laertius' *Parmenides* Ἀμεινία Διοχαίρα. Sotion drew from Timaeus.—G. Kaibel reads in Apul. XI 24 *Osiriacam stolam*, 5 *Ortygiam* Proserpinam, 10 *auxillas id est altaria*.—J.

Vahlen reads in Cic. ad Att. I 14. 3 *utrum <crederet>* Crassum inire and defends *excepisse laudem*; in Cic. de leg. II 26. 66 defends *paratissimus*, reads I 23. 61 *suis circumdatus moenibus*, Gell. I. 9. 3 *idoneusque <inventus>*, 17. 15. 5 *vivendi est <amittantur>*.

E. Fabricius, Zum Stadtrecht von Urso. The first part of the law was made by Caesar, when he planned to found the colony, the second part (c. 123-134) was drawn up after his death by Antony, who presumed to change the regulations regarding *patroni*. The whole was hastily put together by a careless secretary, who copied corrections as well as the part corrected without regard to consistency.

J. Kromayer, Zum griechischen und römischen Heerwesen. In the Macedonian phalanx the distance between the lines as well as the space allotted each man was three feet, and the spear was 21 feet long. These intervals gave elasticity and allowed light-armed troops to pass through, and the space for each man was not too great, since his shield and the spears of the back rows needed room for play. Nor would the spear be too heavy, since, with three feet between the hands, the pressure is barely 6 kg. Moreover, these figures from Polybius agree exactly with mediæval practice in Europe. In the Roman *acies* the spaces were six feet in each direction, since more room was needed for the attack with the sword and for the spring forward or back, whatever might be the weapons of the enemy, but the back rows stood closer together.

J. Beloch, Zur Geschichte des Eurypontidenhauses. All but *two* of Laotychidas' ancestors (Hdt. VIII 131) must have been kings, else he would hardly have succeeded to the throne; the second Messenian War belongs to the time of the elder Laotychidas, the seventh century, and is the subject of Tyrtaeus' poems. It was not King Agis who fell at Mantinea (between 250 and 245 B. C.), but the regent Agis, his cousin. Pausanias' account (VIII 10. 6) of the Arcadian league is consistent with the history and archaeology of the period.

B. Niese, Die beiden Makkabäerbücher. The introduction to 2 Mac. is genuine, for it cannot be separated from the body of the work, nor divided; it does not refer to Antiochus IV, but to Antiochus VII, though with fictitious details, and there was trouble under Demetrius II, as it says. So 2 Mac., which was used by 3 and 4 Mac., was written 125/4 B. C., and is older than 1 Mac. The style of Jason, from whom 2 Mac. was taken, and who wrote about 161-153, is very rhetorical and prone to exaggeration, yet he has the authority of a contemporary. The epitomator increases the religious and marvelous elements, and alters some statements, but shows no enmity to Judas' brothers. 1 Mac. consists of two parts; the first is drawn from Jason, the second (c. 8-15), which is less full and more conversant with Greek sources, is largely

dependent on a chronicle of the Seleucidae. 1 Mac. imitates very well the style of the Old Testament, and thus gained respect, but it condones or omits all that is discreditable to the Jews, changes the right order of events to give a religious impression, and distorts history to strengthen the Asmonean claim to the high priesthood by omitting Jason and Menelaus and emphasizing the importance of Mattathias and Simon. So 2 Mac. is generally more reliable, as in Judas' victories (3. 38, 14. 31 ff.) and the purification of the temple (10. 1 ff.). Antiochus IV died in 165/4, as 2 Mac. tells us, and the error in Eusebius, which was not original but is redactional, came from giving Antiochus III one year too many. The letters in 2 Mac. and the close of 1 Mac. are both genuine, the documents in the latter may be spurious, but are not interpolated. Josephus used Jason or 2 Mac., perhaps not directly.

G. Schultz, Zur Theorie der antiken Metrik. Ancient poetry had no verse accent and often neglected equality of time, in order to avoid the monotonous succession of alternate long and short syllables. Thus the substitution of an iambus in trochaic verse gives variety to the measure, and a similar result is gained in the hexameter by the omission of the second half of the third and sixth feet. Since this left only five whole feet, the elegiac poets rightly called the metre pentameter.

F. Bechtel shows that ἵππος occurs very often in Eretrian names, and in Oxyr. Pap. II 29 reads θακοβαλπάδος.—H. Dessau. The fact that the Asiatic leap-year gave 32 days to March accounts for Galen's statement (XVII 1. 22 K.) that the Roman leap-year was thus constituted, and dates Ps.-Chrysostom's Easter address 387 A. D.—F. Blass extracts verses of Menander from Clem. Alex. I pp. 342 and 399 Ddf. (perhaps pp. 238, 352, 353), and shows that, when poetry was written without notes, the thesis (stress) was marked by a dot beneath, but, when the notes were added, the arsis received the dot above.—M. Conrat proves Hieronymus to be the author of the *Collatio legum Mosaicarum et Romanorum* by his respect for Papinian, his theological attitude, and his ascription of the constitution of 390 to Theodosius.—Th. Mommsen holds that *praetorium* in the *limes* inscriptions means "the governor's dwelling," and shows from a papyrus that the Roman soldiers of the Empire were not paid in cash, but were supplied with necessities, which were charged to their account.

M. Wellmann, Zur Geschichte der Medicin im Alterthum. The source of Athenaeus' medical citations in Books I-III was a critic of Hippocrates, who lived before Varro, but later than Hikesius, as his views on the hygiene of water and wine indicate. This must have been Heraclides of Tarentum, whose Symposium was a compilation of rules for eating and drinking.—Chrysippus' cure for spitting blood by binding the limbs to prevent inflam-

mation shows that he knew Praxagoras' theory that the veins contained the blood, the arteries only air. It was also from Praxagoras that he learned his observation of fever from the pulse. So he flourished about 300 B. C., and his pupil Erasistratus about 260 as physician to Ptolemy II and III. It was Erasistratus' father, Cleombrotus, who lived at the court of Seleucus I and cured Antiochus I in 293.

P. Natorp, *Platos Phaedrus*. The language of the *Phaedrus* places it in the middle period, but it cannot come after the *Republic*, which rejects poetic diction, nor the *Symposium*, which puts Socrates in the background. It was written 392-390, soon after *Isoc.* 13, since it praises the orator's adoption of Platonic doctrines, emphasizes and extends the arguments of the oration, while the attack on Isocrates in the *Euthydemus* excludes any long interval. It also stands close to the *Gorgias*, which was written 394; its milder tone is for contrast and for conciliation. Its presentation of the doctrine of ideas in somewhat vague language and as a novel conception puts it earlier than the middle dialogues; its positive tone marks a new epoch. Since dialectic appears as a strange term, the *Phaedrus* is earlier than the *Euthydemus* and *Cratylus*, which use the word freely, while its method and cosmology show only a slight advance upon the *Gorgias*. It lacks the fundamental notions of the *Theaetetus*, and the the principles (*ἀρχαί*) of the *Phaedo*. The strong contrast that it makes between being and becoming is a further reason for assigning the *Phaedrus* to an earlier date than that of the *Phaedo*, the *Phaedo* showing greater freedom from Eleatic influence. The *Phaedo* also uses closer reasoning to prove immortality from spontaneous motion, and gives a clearer argument for the separation of the physical and the spiritual. Though the punishment of the damned may seem severer in the *Phaedrus*, this is no indication of a later date, for such details are artistic, not philosophic.

M. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Lesefrüchte*, reads *Lys.* 32. 7 *τέως μὲν τὴν θυγατέρα* and *ib.* 20 brackets *ἰμάρια*; publishes the decree of BCH XX 124, which is later than 20 A. D., marking the rhythms and noting the periphrases as characteristic of the Asiatic style; shows in BCH IV 352 that the *Myrinus* and *Dioscurides* who are already known, lived as late as Augustus, and so are not the persons mentioned in this inscription; reads *Pl. Soph.* 221 *ῥάβδους καὶ τεράμνοισι*, denies any reference to a women's rights movement in the *Medea*, since abstract philosophy is often put in the mouth of the chorus, and holds that the stories regarding *Aspasia's* culture are fictitious; *Thuc.* II 6. 2-3 is a later addition by the author, in order to free the Athenians from guilt, but ch. 7-24, speeches and all, were written at the beginning of the war, while *Archidamus* and *Pericles* were still prominent; *Il.* XIX 369-424 is a late addition derived from XVI 130-154 and XVII 426-440.

G. Busolt, *Zur Chronologie des peloponnesischen Krieges*. We must put the first invasion of Attica in June, when we consider that the precession of equinoxes made the harvest twelve days later in Hesiod's time (Works 383) than now, that the farmer regards an early season as the norm, and that the enemy were on this occasion delayed two weeks beyond the time they had originally intended to make their invasion. Moreover, Italian harvests are now a month earlier than in antiquity. The treasury decrees and the time of the Lesbian revolt confirm this date.

D. Detlefsen, *Die Werthangaben in der Naturalis Historia des Plinius*. The order of values compiled by Pliny was: diamond, pearl, emerald, citrus-wood, myrrhines, crystal, amber, cinnamon, balsam, gold, ivory, silk, purple, nard, silphium, silver, cochineal, tortoise-shell, ostrich-feathers. In giving the prices of perfumes and condiments he follows tradesmen's lists. He also gives prices for slaves, animals, wines and food-stuffs.

R. Reitzenstein, *Aus der Strassburger Papyrussammlung*, publishes a fragment of Ar. Nub. (1371-91, 1407-28), which shows that R and V are by no means to be trusted to the exclusion of the other MSS. He also publishes fragments of Apollonius Rhodius (3. 145-161), Favorinus and scholia to Iliad I, and reads in *pap. gr.* 53. l. 12 *καὶ ἀπει]σιν*. This last document shows the prototype from which the Greek originals of Terence's prologues developed.

C. F. Lehmann, *Weiteres zu Aristoteles 'Αθηναίων πολιτεία X*. Solon introduced the Euboean talent to supplant the Aeginetan, and to help the poor, who could get more for their money and discharge obligations with the new coinage. The stater here is the double mina. The error regarding measures may be due to a provision that heaped-up measure should be used in certain cases. Pheidon flourished 754 B. C., and Hdt. VI 127 is taken from Hecataeus without regard to chronology.

C. Robert, *Archaeologische Nachlese*. The Capitoline head (Helbig 478) is an ideal portrait of Hesiod; this type like the common type of blind Homer, was invented by the Rhodian school, while the type in the mosaic of Monnus belongs to the fourth century, like the blind Homer of Silanion (Helbig 283). The scene of the Aldobrandini marriage is the maiden's chamber, the male figure is Hymenaeus, the musician is hired for the procession, and beside her is the *nymphentria* with a servant, while at the left the mother prepares to sprinkle the bride with holy water. The frieze of the Meidias vase represents Attic heroes living with Medea in the garden of the Hesperides. In the cameo de la Sainte Chapelle the suppliant is Vonones, the bearer of the globe is Phraatakes, both Parthian kings, and the rider of the winged horse is C. Caesar entering Hades and receiving the homage of Phraatakes. The prince on the Brunswick onyx vase is also C. Caesar.

A. Stein dates the fall of Commodus' favorite Perennis in 185 by CIL III Supp. 14137, which mentions Longaeus Rufus as *praefectus praetorio* in Nov. 185.—M. Lehnerdt shows that the 14th century possessed no more of Tacitus' *Historiae* than we do.—P. Stengel calls attention to the fact that the winds were not regularly worshipped till the thank-offerings of the Persian War were instituted, but very early the evil winds were propitiated by chthonic sacrifices, which indicate that like the Harpies, they were originally conceived as ghosts.—G. Kaibel shows how Latin epitaphs often imitate Greek elegies (as Call. XXVI, Anth. Pal. VII 461, 500) and unite distichs of diverse origin and doubtful suitability.—A. Wilhelm reads in an inscription cited by Plutarch (p. 1033 e R.) *τὸν νέκρον*.—W. Frantz extracts a fragment of the comedian Philipides from Plut. Demetr. 12.

BARKER NEWHALL.

BRIEF MENTION.

I have no apology to make for the syntactical notes with which I am apt to befreckle the pages of *Brief Mention*. Doubtless to many readers of the Journal they are so many impertinences, but long before Blass began to write I had learned the truth of what he told us some years ago about our ignorance of the most elementary matters in Greek syntax¹; and, as I take up the new editions of various Greek authors I am glad to note the tokens of a quickened conscience and to observe, besides references to the well-known manuals, the efforts that are made to put the phenomena in a new light. This is one of the characteristics of Professor EARLE'S work, and this is one of the features of his *Oedipus Tyrannus* (American Book Co.) which is evidently the fruit of independent study. So when he comes to v. 68: ἦν δ' εὖ σκοπῶν ἡῤῥισκον ἱασιν μόνην | ταύτην ἐπραξα, he is careful to warn the young student against translating ἡῤῥισκον by 'was finding' or 'kept finding,' and gives what he evidently considers a new reason for Jebb's translation 'could find.' 'The imperfect of frustrated effort,' says Professor EARLE, 'in such a phrase as οὐχ ἡῤῥισκον ἱασιν ἄλλην is extended by false analogy to the phrase ταύτην ἡῤῥισκον μόνην.' This is the way in which the late Gustav Fischer, a man who studied Latin at first hand, used to account for *sunt qui* with the subjunctive as a manner of 'false analogy' to *non sunt qui* with the subjunctive. But Fischer's and EARLE'S way of working backward from negative to positive is not necessary here for μόνην involves a negative and ἡῤῥισκον μόνην is = οὐχ ἡῤῥισκον εἰ μὴ μίαν. And after all 'kept finding' is not so bad. The translation is poor but the conception is correct. 'The more I kept considering the more I kept finding' shows the inevitableness of the conclusion which was borne in upon the seeker by the search. In Dionys. Hal. Dem. 47 (p. 1100 R.) we read ἐξήτει, εὗρισκε used in just this way of seeking and finding. 'But Dionysios is a *Graeculus*.' True! But much Greek is to be learned from those who had to learn it themselves, or at all events, had to acquire the secrets of classical expression and when a Greek of the Atticizing period, when a Greek of the Renaissance makes a grammatical point he is apt to have some reason for it. So everyone has a shy at Philostratus, or rather the Philostrati, but I am grateful to Philostratus for his anecdote of Herodes Atticus which shows that the difference between μή and the present imperative and μή with the aorist subjunctive, lives with full

¹ Rh. Mus. XLIV (1889), 7: So weit sind wir im Verständniss der gewöhnlichen griechischen Prosa noch zurück, dass wir nicht einmal dies elementarste Ding, den Artikel, verstehen.

vigor in the final clause (A. J. P. IV 426 N.). As for 'frustrated effort' I have been petitioned by many teachers to remove 'Resistance to Pressure' from the place it has occupied in my syntactical system for thirty odd years, but that is a pressure which I have steadily resisted and the efforts of my well-meaning advisers have been frustrated. 'Frustrated effort' does not represent both 'would' and 'could,' and 'frustrated effort' produces the effect of a finality. Not so 'Resistance to Pressure.'

Writing of Dionysios I am tempted to cite a passage which bears on the aoristic use of $\xi\acute{\xi}\omega$. That the proper aoristic future is $\sigma\chi\acute{\eta}\sigma\omega$ I freely grant. Blass insists on it at length in his well-known article, Rh. M. XLVII (1892), 285. In fact how natural the distinction between $\xi\acute{\xi}\omega$ and $\sigma\chi\acute{\eta}\sigma\omega$ is, comes out very distinctly in the medical use of $\xi\acute{\xi}\iota\varsigma$ and $\sigma\chi\acute{\epsilon}\iota\varsigma$, which Blass ought to have cited. But E. R. Schulze showed long ago in Fleckeisen's Jahrb., 1883, p. 163 foll. that in the whole body of the Attic orators the uncompounded $\sigma\chi\acute{\eta}\sigma\omega$ is used only in seven places, and these in the genuine orations of Demosthenes, against 211 $\xi\acute{\xi}\omega$'s, a clear indication that the form had become bookish and that $\xi\acute{\xi}\omega$ had to carry both the durative and the aoristic significance just as $\alpha\rho\acute{\xi}\omega$ does. The distinction is a true distinction, a basic distinction, but for all that it may lie dormant; and so when Dionys. Hal. Dem. 19 (p. 1010 R.) undertakes to improve on Isokrates he substitutes for $\epsilon\iota\ \mu\grave{\eta}\ \tau\eta\eta\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\eta\ \epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\upsilon\upsilon\varsigma\ \tau\iota\mu\eta\eta\ \xi\acute{\xi}\omicron\mu\epsilon\upsilon$ the shorter version $\epsilon\iota\ \mu\grave{\eta}\ \tau\omega\upsilon\ \iota\varsigma\omega\upsilon\ \tau\epsilon\upsilon\acute{\xi}\omicron\mu\epsilon\theta\alpha$.

In 1826 Bremi brought the French scholar Auger up with a round turn for translating $\omicron\upsilon\chi\ \delta\pi\omega\varsigma$ (Lys. 19, 31) by *non solum* instead of *tantum aberat ut*, but the lesson does not seem to have been heeded as it should have been except by the editors of Lysias, who have meekly followed Bremi's suit. The blunder, if one dare call it blunder now, inherited from Reiske has been propagated by Kühner II², p. 801, and the *non solum* version reappears in the latest edition of *Demosthenes de Corona*, one which has been justly received with universal acclaim by the philological world. On §131 Professor Goodwin the *Doctor irrefragabilis* of Greek Syntax sticks to the view presented in his *Moods and Tenses*, 707, and translates $\omicron\upsilon\chi\ \delta\pi\omega\varsigma$ in the Lysianic passage by *not only*. The meaning of the passage is not evident on the face of it, but Bremi seems to have made *not only* not plain enough by his reference to Meier, and if Bremi is wrong, the war must be carried into the domain of Attic antiquities.

HILLER V. GÄRTRINGEN'S lecture on *Ausgrabungen in Griechenland* (Berlin, Reimer) shows how fascinating the subject of excavations can be made without a parade of lantern

slides. Archaeologists, who have no camera in their brains are a tiresome lot to outsiders, and I have heard in my time many archaeological 'talks' which would have gained immensely if the lecturer had gone to the school of the story-teller and learned how to draw a mental picture. The impression that many hearers, or rather spectators, carry away from discourses on ancient ruins is that of a shipwrecked landlubber scrambling over rocks. One knows that he is going to be saved, but one actually resents it.

In the last twelvemonth much has happened to recall the years of my German apprenticeship. Of my German fellow students during my one semester in Berlin (1850-1851) I saw little and remember less, which is not always the case with writers of memoirs. But of my Göttingen contemporaries, Baumeister and Wölfflin, both destined to wide repute and wide influence, stand out distinctly in my memory, and of the Ritschelians, next to my nearest friend, Emil Hübner, the figure of VAHLEN with whom I have not exchanged a word in all these years is as present to my mind's eye as if we were both still listening to the voice of the great scholar whom we called master. I know that this is no place for personal reminiscence, but *Brief Mention* is rather lawless in these latter years, on satanic principles, and a personal reminiscence may be pardoned even by the most severe in the notice of a personal tribute that has recently been paid to an illustrious scholar, the *Festschrift Johannes Vahlen zum siebenzigsten Geburtstage gewidmet von seinen Schülern* (Berlin, Reimer); and none of the contributors will take it amiss, if I say that nothing in the weighty volume of 692 pages with all its wealth of learning and its variety of contents has interested me so much as VON HARTEL'S brief preface, which summarizes a career in which fulfilment has met the prophecy of all VAHLEN'S fellow students of that distant day. He was a man of mark even then; and as students are apt to take the professor for granted as *hors concours* and to reserve their enthusiasm for their own fugleman, so VAHLEN had his full share of our homage, such as our immediate predecessors seem to have paid to Ribbeck who had recently left a trail of glory behind him. At all events, I remember how VAHLEN'S *Ennius* was welcomed by those who had sat on the same benches; and with what awe we watched the young critic step boldly into a field that is studded with caltrops for unwary feet, a field in which he has shown from that day to this a mastery in the handling of his art, which has evoked admiration everywhere. Emulation? That is a different matter; and in those who are less gifted, the reserve which his example has taught may have degenerated into despair, so that owing to VAHLEN the scholarly world is possibly the poorer by a number of 'convincing emendations,' of 'evident restorations.' But any one who has had to consider the hosts of clever and

semi-clever and wholly absurd conjectures, that rush to the front as first aids to the wounded whenever a text presents any appearance of damage or gets into any appreciable difficulty, will be grateful to a man who has steadily put aside the fancies of the moment, and the guesses that do not satisfy the guesser himself, a man in short, who has carried out the rule: 'First exhaust interpretation.' But that does not mean the glorification of absolute nonsense, and in order to get the positive results that VAHLEN has achieved, one must have VAHLEN's endowments. 'Es setzt,' says VON HARTEL, after characterizing VAHLEN's success, 'es setzt liebevolle Vertiefung in den Sprachgebrauch, welche weder Grammatik noch Lexikon noch die emsigste Statistik zu vermitteln vermag, feine Empfindung für die Form, verständnisvolles Eingehen in die Eigentümlichkeiten des Schriftstellers, ein Miterleben und Mitempfinden des vom Schriftsteller Erlebten und Empfundenen, also Vorzüge voraus, welche durch unablässige Uebung zwar geschärft, aber durch sie allein nicht erworben werden.' τὸ δὲ φύα κράτιστον ἄπαν.

There are thirty-five pieces in the volume; and a summary of each of them would require too much space for the limited area of *Brief Mention*, as a criticism would demand a range of knowledge to which few could pretend. The first article, by OTTO RUBENSOHN, gives an extremely interesting account of the *Sign of an Interpreter of Dreams*, the last a discussion of the *Object, Occasion and Date of the Phaedrus of Plato*, by CARL VON HOLZINGER, which deals with Lutoslawski's view of this dialogue in a fashion that shows no dread of the new-comer's stylistic investigations and logical developments. Perhaps these two will serve as well as any other two to stake out the field. One of the articles that will be likely to attract especial attention is RUDOLF HELM'S *De metamorphoseon Ovidianarum locis duplici recensione servatis* in which the *duplex recensio* is carried back to the poet himself, so that we are not forced to decide which is more Ovidian than which; and very timely is KARL BRANDT'S *De Horatii studiis Bacchylideis* in which the writer follows the busy Matinian bee as he rifles the clover field that gracious Fortune has recently thrown open to Greek scholars. The more Greek one finds, the more Greek one learns, the less 'originality' will be left in Horace. As if 'originality' mattered!

À propos of VAHLEN's seventieth birthday, and I may add, WÖLFFLIN's seventieth birthday also recently celebrated by an elaborate address, I hope that it will not be considered beneath the dignity of a philological journal, if I cite from the *Berliner Zeitschrift für Gymnasialwesen*, April, 1900, a charming little poem of PAUL HEYSE's written in commemoration of another

distinguished scholar who a few years ago reached the snow line, which so few are permitted to pass.

Wem ein freundlich Geschick Fülle der Gaben lieh,
Helles Auge, zu schau'n weit in der Zeiten Lauf,
Weisheit, Adel der Seele,
Sinn für jegliches Musenwerk,

Wohl unalternd empor klimmt er des Lebens Höh,'
Neu allmorgendlich tagt Sonne des Wirkens ihm,
Und es blühen ihm Rosen
Unterm silbernen Winterschnee.

V. WILAMOWITZ MOELLENDORFF'S collection of *Reden und Vorträge* (Berlin, Weidmann) is dedicated to five of his old teachers at Schulpforte, all of whom have passed away since he left the famous school now more than thirty-three years ago; and the words of the dedication are well worth the consideration of those who are apt to repine, when they leave the studies of the university for what they deem the drudgery of secondary education. It is precisely in the upper class of the boys' school that WILAMOWITZ sees the manifestation of the true glory of the teacher's vocation. In his judgment the university professor is in this respect quite subordinate to the real teacher of the higher forms. 'If the university man treats his *commilitones* as pupils, he is worth precious little. At best he is a *θιασάρχης* of fellow-learners and fellow-investigators. But the teacher who wakes the slumbering Psyche or guides the first wavings of the wings of the awaking spirit, he is the bearer of the divine power of that Eros, who is the mediator between men and gods.' That is eloquently said and a man who can look back with gratitude and loyalty on such teachers as Carl Peter and Carl Steinhart and Wilhelm Corssen can always look up to them, whatever he himself may have attained. But the conditions in America are different from those which obtain in Germany or rather which obtained in Germany, and the university professors here need not renounce the Eros rôle. Even at a time when the preparation for the German university seems to have been more thorough than it is now, the Eros teacher had his part to play, as I well remember. The principle 'Be not called masters' will always abide for the highest instruction, but the great university teachers are after all not mere *θιασάρχαι*, and the domination of genius will make itself felt.

These *Discourses and Praelections* go back more than twenty years—the earliest date seems to be 1877—and in his character of *θιασάρχης* WILAMOWITZ has not hesitated to point out here and there the errors and limitations of his treatment wherever new light had come to him meanwhile. But the form he has left substantially unchanged and any one who has made a collection of old

papers will sympathize with him when he says that the frame of mind in each case determined the style and cannot be reproduced. The leading article is a revision of his memorable essay 'Was ist Uebersetzen?' (A. J. P. XIII 517), the longest and earliest is the discourse 'On the Glory of the Athenian Empire', which has naturally undergone a number of changes. The lapse of time and the recovery from the panegyric mood have brought with them much reconsideration, and it is refreshing to find that in 1901 the author allows the Peloponnesians their right to live their own life and acknowledges that in 1879 he did not understand Pindar. The tone reminds one of a certain condescension of Prussians toward Hanoverians of which I was witness fifty years ago. That the volume is full of manifold incitement to thought and rebellion is a matter of course, for this is WILAMOWITZ'S rôle in the world of classical philology and I, for one, am grateful to him for the animation he has given to our studies; and yet to me the most attractive of all these papers is that in which there is least of the 'Rough Rider,' and the final essay, 'An den Quellen des Clitumnus,' begun in 1879, and recently finished, has a peaceful charm that tempts the reader to reread.

In an interesting article on Nietzsche, published in the *Neue Jahrbücher* of last year, R. M. MEYER says: <Ein Kunstwerk> ist das Wort von 'der blonden Bestie' oder das andere vom 'lachen-den Löwen.' Whatever the source of the 'blond beast' may be, the source of the 'laughing lion' is perfectly known to every classical scholar. It is the $\acute{o} \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega\nu \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\alpha\sigma\epsilon\nu$ of the scholiast on Thukydides I, 126, which no one that has read Thukydides as a philologist reads him, as Nietzsche read him, is likely to forget. In another paper in the same volume the same writer has taken up a theme which is as dangerous as it is fascinating, 'Das Alter einiger Schlagworte.' As the author has made German literature of the nineteenth century his special domain, a foreigner would not like to enter the lists with him, but it may be said that there is nothing more fallacious than watching the emergence of a phrase in print. Of course, the best of the dictionaries in use leave one in the lurch. The only authority cited for 'neck and crop' by the Century Dictionary is my contemporary, George Augustus Sala, and the Oxford Dictionary bids us wait for NECK—which I shall never live to see. Some of Herr Meyer's 'Schlagworte,' whatever their age in German, are very ancient in English, and most people will be astounded to find 'rechte Hand' set down as a German neologism and to learn that 'Drohne' in a 'sociological' sense has just come into general use. The chapter on the compounds in 'hoch' has a painful interest for me inasmuch as in the first edition of my Pindar, p. x, I was betrayed into the Teutonism 'high poetic,' which was at once and justly pounced upon by the critics. True, I might have defended my-

self by Shakespeare's 'high-fantastical,' but I was not thinking of Shakespeare so much as of 'hochpoetisch,' and there was no honest course except to submit and withdraw.

K. F. S.: In his youth Dr. J. Börner suffered constantly from the nightmare. But having an enquiring mind he utilized his affliction for the purposes of a dissertation which made him famous. His results, derived from a long series of careful experiments on himself and others, were afterwards fully verified by later investigators. Among other things he showed that, in a healthy person, nightmare is usually due to partial suffocation caused by burying one's head in the pillow, coverlet, etc., that the rapidity with which the Alp appears to approach his victim is always measured by the rate of suffocation, but, above all, that the appearance of the Alp himself is, to a surprising extent, determined by the sleeper's surroundings, especially by the material and texture of his coverings.

No student of the classics and certainly no student who has had the courage to 'sit it out' with Sprenger, Nicholas Remy and Pierre de l'Ancre, 'Conseiller du Roy,' at their horrid assizes of blood and fire, can have failed to be struck by the fact that the Incubi, Succubi, Striges, Vampires and all their monstrous brood must have entered this world in the first place by the Ivory Gate. If so, it is certain that some of our most cherished legends, our best and most thrilling stories, our finest poetry are, literally, the stuff that dreams are made of, although Laistner's theory that the Uralptraum was the father of all mythology is an unwarrantable extension of his prototype

Quippe etenim iam tum divum mortalia saecula
Egregias animo facies vigilante videbant
Et magis in somnis mirando corporis auctu.

Nevertheless, it may be that as the Jinni rose from the smoke of the Fisherman's bottle so Merlin's famous pedigree rose from the fumes of too much haggis. Armed with the results of Börner we might now suspect with ROSCHER (*Ephialtes, eine pathologisch-mythologische Abhandlung über die Alpträume und Alpdämonen des klassischen Altertums*, Teubner) that Pan's legs were the natural result of the style of bed-quilts used by his primaeval worshippers. Compare Latinus's method of securing an interview with Faunus (Aen. VII 81 f.). We might even agree that, in discussing the event which led to the change of Jacob's name, it is worth while to consider the heavy dews of the Orient and the fact that he may again have 'taken of stones of that place, and put them for his pillows.' However that may be, the name of ROSCHER attached to any treatise connected with his lifelong specialty is sufficient guarantee of sound scholarship and of pleasure and profit in the reading.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 812 Broadway, New York, for material furnished.

AMERICAN.

Durham (C. L.) The subjunctive substantive clauses in Plautus, not including indirect questions. New York, *Macmillan*, 1901. c. 6 + 120 pp. 8vo, net, 80 cts.

Green (S. G.) Handbook to the grammar of the Greek Testament. Rev. imp. ed. New York and Chicago, *Revell*, 1901. 564 pp. 12mo, cl., \$2.

Meador (Clarence Linton). The Latin pronouns, is, hic, iste, ipse. New York, *Macmillan*, 1901. c. 16 + 222 pp. 12mo, cl., net, \$1.40.

Plato. The Meno of Plato; ed., with introd., notes and excursions, by E. Seymer Thompson. New York, *Macmillan*, 1901. 66 + 319 pp. 12mo, cl., net, \$1.10.

Studies in classical philology. v. 1. Chicago, *University of Chicago Press*, 1901. 250 pp. 12mo, bds., net, \$1.50.

Tyrrell (R. Y.) Anthology of Latin poetry. New York, *Macmillan*, 1901. 8 + 310 pp. 12mo, cl., net, \$1.50.

ENGLISH.

Abbot (L.) Life and Literature of the ancient Hebrews. London, 1901. 8vo, 422 pp. 6s.

Browne (H.) Triglot Dictionary of Scriptural representative Words in Hebrew, Greek and English. London, 1901. 8vo. 21s.

Demosthenes. On the Crown. With critical and explanatory Notes, a historical Sketch and Essays by W. W. Goodwin. London, 1901. 8vo, IX, 368 pp. 12s. 6d.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus: Three literary Letters (ad Ammaeum 1, 2, ad Pompeium). Greek Text edited with English Translation, by W. Rhys Roberts. London, 1901. 8vo, 232 pp. 9s.

Ellis (R.) New Fragments of Juvenal. A Lecture. London, 1901. 8vo. 1s.

Hinde (H.) Masai Language, grammatical Notes and Vocabulary. London, 1901. 8vo, 76 pp. 3s. 6d.

The Jataka, or Stories of the Buddha's former Births. Translated from Pāli under Editorship of E. B. Cowell. Vol. IV. Translated by W. H. D. Rouse. London, 1901. 8vo, 320 pp. 12s. 6d.

Kennett (R. H.) Short Account of the Hebrew Tenses. London, 1901. 8vo, 104 pp. 3s.

Ridgeway (W.) Early Age of Greece. Vol. I. London, 1901. 8vo, 684 pp. 21s.

St. Clair (G.) Myths of Greece explained and dated. 2 vols. London, 1901. 8vo, 798 pp. 16s.

Tyrrell (R. Y.) and L. C. Purser. Correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero. Vol. VII. London and New York, *Longmans, Green & Co.*, 1901. 5 + 167 pp. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

Whittaker (T.) Neo-Platonists. Study in History of Hellenism. London, 1901. 8vo. 7s. 6d.

FRENCH.

Dufour (M.) Études de métrique et de rythmique sur le Prométhée enchaîné d'Eschyle. *Tallandier*. 2 fr. 50.

Dussaud (R.) et F. Macler. Voyage archéologique au Safâ et dans le Djebel ed Druz. Paris, 1901. 8vo, 227 pp. 10 fr.

Gautier (V.) La Langue, les noms et le droit des anciens Germains (283 pp.), in-8vo. *Fischbacher*. 9 fr. 50.

Largeau (V.) Encyclopédie pahouine (Congo français). Paris, 1901. 8vo, 700 pp. 12 fr.

Toscanne (P.) Inscriptions cunéiformes du Musée du Louvre. Paris, 1901. 4to. 12 fr.

Yve-Plessis (R.) Bibliographie raisonnée de l'Argot et de la langue verte en France du XV^e au XX^e siècle. Paris, 1901. 8vo, 180 pp. 7 fr. 50 c.

GERMAN.

Aischylos: Perser. Erklärt v. W. S. Teuffel. 4. Aufl., bearb. v. N. Wecklein. gr. 8. vi, 104 S. Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 1.50.

Bibliothek, keilinschriftliche. Sammlung v. assyr. u. babylon. Texten. Hrsg. v. Eberh. Schrader. gr. 8. Berlin, *Reuther & Reichard*.—VI, 1. Jensen, P.: Assyrisch-babylonische Mythen u. Epen. II. Hälfte. 1. Lfg. (S. 321-464). 1901. m. 9.

Briefe aus der Frühzeit der deutschen Philologie an Georg Friedrich Benecke. Hrsg. v. Dr. Rud. Baier. gr. 8. x, 173 S. Leipzig, 1901, *Dieterich*. m. 3.60.

Cicero's Rede üb. das Imperium des Cn. Pompeius. Erklärt v. Fr. Richter u. Alfr. Eberhard. 5. Aufl. gr. 8. 105 S. Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner*. m. —75.

Codices graeci et latini photographice depicti duce Scatone de Vries. Tom. VI. gr. Fol. Leiden, *A. W. Sijthoff*. Geb. in Halbldr.—VI. Homeri Ilias cum scholiis. Codex Venetus A, Marcianus 454 phototypice editus. Praefatus est Domin. Comparetti. (XIV S. u. 641 S. in Phototyp.) 1901. m. 310.

Dionis Cocceiani, Cassii, historiarum romanarum quae supersunt, edidit Ursulus Phpp. Boissevain. Vol. III. gr. 8. xviii, 800 S. Berlin, 1901, *Weidmann*. m. 32.

Gabelentz (Geo. v. der). Die Sprachwissenschaft, ihre Aufgaben, Methoden u. bisherigen Ergebnisse. 2. Aufl. Hrsg. von Albr. Graf v. der Schulenburg. Lex. 8. xxi, 520 S. Leipzig, 1901, *Ch. H. Tauchnitz*. m. 15.

Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft in systematischer Darstellung. Hrsg. von Iwan v. Müller. II. Bd., 3. Abtlg. gr. 8. München, *C. H. Beck*.—II, 3. Rhetorik u. Metrik der Griechen u. Römer. 3. Aufl.

Volkman, Dr. Rich.: Rhetorik. 3. Aufl., besorgt v. Casp. Hammer.—Gleditsch, H.: Metrik, nebst e. Anh. üb. die Musik der Griechen, m. 2 Notentaf. x, 336 S. 1901. m. 8.80; geb., m. 10.60.

Herakleitos v. Ephesos. Griechisch u. deutsch v. Herm. Diels. gr. 8. xii, 56 S. Berlin, 1901, *Weidmann*. m. 2.40.

Herondae mimiambi. Tertium ed. Otto Crusius. Ed. minor. Exemplar emendatum. 8. iii, 96 S. Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner*. m. 2.40.

Kallenberg (Herm.) Textkritik u. Sprachgebrauch Diodors. I. Progr. 4. 23 S. Berlin, 1901, *R. Gaertner*. m. 1.

Klausning (Gust.) Die Schicksale der lateinischen Proparoxytona im Französischen. gr. 8. 90 S. Kiel, 1900, *R. Cordes* in Komm. m. 2.

König (Ed.) Hebräisch u. Semitisch. Prolegomena u. Grundlinien e. Geschichte der semit. Sprachen. gr. 8. vii, 128 S. Berlin, 1901, *Reuther & Reichard*. m. 4.

Kröll (Mich.) Die Beziehungen des klassischen Alterthums zu den hl. Schriften des Alten u. Neuen Testaments. gr. 8. ix, 66 S. Trier, 1901, *Paulinus-Druckerei*. m. 1.20.

Landberg (Comte de). Études sur les dialectes de l'Arabie méridionale. Vol. I: Ḥaḍramūt. gr. 8. xxi, 774 S. Leiden, 1901, *Buchh. u. Druckerei vorm. E. J. Brill*. m. 20.

Litteraturdenkmäler, lateinische, des XV. u. XVI. Jahrh. Hrsg. v. Max Herrmann. 15. 8. Berlin, *Weidmann*.—15. Veterator (Maistre Paletina) u. Advocatus. Zwei Pariser Studentenkommödien aus den J. 1512 u. 1532. Hrsg. v. Johs. Bolte. xxxii, 122 S. 1901. m. 3.

Meyer (Leo). Handbuch der griechischen Etymologie. 1. Bd. Wörter m. dem Anlaut α, ε, ο, η, ω. gr. 8. 656 S. Leipzig, 1901, *S. Hirzel*. m. 14.

Meyer-Lübke (Wilh.) Die Betonung im Gallischen. [Aus: "Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss."] gr. 8. 71 S. Wien, 1901, *C. Gerold's Sohn* in Komm. m. 1.60.

Minos (Johs.) Ein neu entdecktes Geheimschriftsystem der Alten. gr. 8. viii, 64 S. Leipzig, 1901, *Buchh. G. Fock* in Komm. m. 2.40.

Quellen u. Forschungen zur Sprach- u. Culturgeschichte der germanischen Völker. Hrsg. v. Alois Brandl, Ernst Martin, Erich Schmidt. 87. Hft. gr. 8. Strassburg, *K. J. Trübner*.—87. Kock (Axel): Die alt- u. neuschwedische Accentuierung unter Berücksicht. der andern nordischen Sprachen. xii, 298 S. 1901. m. 7.50.

Rauschen (Gerh.) Das griechisch-römische Schulwesen zur Zeit des ausgehenden Heidentums. 8. vi, 86 S. m. 1 Abbildg. Bonn, 1901, *F. Cohen*. m. 1.60.

Rhousopoulos (Rhousos A.) Wörterbuch der neugriechischen u. deutschen Sprache, m. e. Verzeichnisse griech. Eigennamen. 8. viii, 1080 S. Athen, 1900. Leipzig, *E. Haberland* in Komm. m. 10.

Rohde (Erwin). Kleine Schriften. 2 Bde. gr. 8. Tübingen, 1901, *J. C. B. Mohr*. m. 24.—1. Beiträge zur Chronologie, Quellenkunde u. Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur. xxxi, 436 S. 2. Beiträge zur Geschichte des Romans u. der Novelle, zur Sagen-, Märchen- u. Alterthumskunde. iii, 481 S.

Saga-Bibliothek, altnordische. Hrsg. v. Gust. Cederschiöld, Hugo Gering u. Eug. Mogk. 9 Hft. gr. 8. Halle, *M. Niemeyer*.—9. Friþjófs saga ins frœkna. Hrsg. v. Ludv. Larsson. xxiv, 56 S. 1901. m. 2.

Schäfer (Heinr.) Die äthiopische Königsinschrift des Berliner Museums, neu hrsg. u. erklärt. Mit 4 Lichtdr.-Taf. u. 1 Textabbildg. gr. 4. vii S. u. 136 S. in Autogr. Leipzig, 1901, *J. C. Hinrichs' Verl.* m. 22.

Schrader (O.) Reallexikon der indogermanischen Altertumskunde. 2. Halbbd. gr. 8. xl u. S. 561-1048. Strassburg, 1901, *K. J. Trübner.* m. 13; kplt., m. 27; geb. in Halbfz., m. 30.

Schwally (Frdr.) Semitische Kriegsaltertümer. 1. Hft. Der hl. Krieg im alten Israel. gr. 8. viii, 111 S. Leipzig, 1901, *Dieterich.* m. 3.

Solmsen (Felix.) Untersuchungen zur griechischen Laut- u. Verslehre. gr. 8. ix, 322 S. Strassburg, 1901, *K. J. Trübner.* m. 8.

Tacitus: Germania. Für den Schulgebrauch erklärt von Dr. Geo. v. Kobilinski. Text u. Anmerkgn. gr. 8. Berlin, 1901, *Weidmann.* Geb., m. 1.80.—Text. (28 S. m. 1 Karte.) Geb., m.—60; Anmerkungen. (100 S.) Geb., m. 1.20.

Thesaurus linguae latinae. Editus auctoritate et consilio academiarum quinque germanicarum. Vol. II. Fasc. 1. Imp. 4. (Sp. 1-240.) Leipzig, 1901, *B. G. Teubner.* Subskr.-Pr., m. 7.20.

Thiel (Aug.) Iuvenalis graecissans sive de vocibus graecis apud Iuvenalem. gr. 8. x, 152 S. Breslau, 1901, *Preuss & Jünger.* m. 4.

Tituli Asiae Minoris. Conlecti et ed. auspiciis caesareae academiae litterarum Vindobonensis. Vol. I. Tituli Lyciae Lingua Lycia conscripti, enarravit Ernest. Kalinka. Tabulam ad Henrici Kiepert exemplum redactam adiecit Rud. Heberdey. gr. Fol. vi, 136 S. m. fig. Wien, 1901, *A. Hölder.* Geb. in Halbpergament, m. 40.

Werner (Jak.) Notkers Sequenzen. gr. 8. iv, 130 S. Aarau, 1901, *H. R. Sauerländer & Co.* m. 2.50.

Zell (Th.) Polyphem e. Gorilla. (Odyssee Buch IX, V. 105 ffige.) gr. 8. vi, 184 S. Berlin, 1901, *W. Junk.* m. 2.50.

ITALIAN.

Aristotele. La costituzione di Atene. Testo e commento per cura di Achille Cosattini. Firenze. 8vo, p. 262 e facsimile. L. 3.

Licofrone. La Alessandra di Licofrone. Testo, traduzione e commento per cura di Emanuele Ciaceri. Catania. 8vo, p. 387. L. 8.

Miscellanea linguistica in onore di Graziadio Ascoli. Torino. 4to, p. 634 e ritratto. L. 40.

Rossi (F.) Grammatica egizia nelle tre scritture: geroglifica, demotica e copta. Torino. 8vo, p. 314. L. 6.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Adler (Cyrus) and Casanowicz (I. M.) Descriptive Catalogue of Objects of Jewish Ceremonial (Smithsonian Institution). Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1901.

American Bureau of Ethnology. Seventeenth Annual Report. Part I, 1895-96. Eighteenth Annual Report. Part I, 1896-97. J. W. Powell, Director. Washington, *Government Printing Office*.

American Journal of Archaeology. Second Series. Vol. I, No. 1. January-March. New York, *The Macmillan Co.* \$1.50. \$5 per annum.

Babcock (Clinton L.) A Study in Case Rivalry, being an investigation regarding the use of the Genitive and Accusative in Latin with Verbs of Remembering and Forgetting (Cornell Studies, No. XIV). New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1901. 60 cts.

Bennett (C. E.) The Stipulative Subjunctive in Latin. *Transactions of the American Philological Association*. Vol. XXXI. 1900.

Callaway (Morgan). The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon. *Modern Language Association*. Vol. XVI, No. 2. Baltimore, 1901.

Capps (Edward). Studies in Greek Agonistic inscriptions. *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.* Vol. XXXI. 1900.

Cicero's Second Philippic. Ed. with introduction and commentary by E. G. Sihler. New York, *Un. Publ. Co.*, 1901. 80 cts.

Ciceronis (M. T.) De Officiis. Liber I. Ed. with introd. and commentary. New York, *University Publ. Co.*, 1901. 90 cts.

Collar (W. C.) and Daniell (M. G.) First Year Latin. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1901.

Demoulin (Hubert). Épiménide de Crète (Mémoire couronné). Bruxelles, *Lamertin*, 1901. 4 fr.

Diels (Hermann). Herakleitos von Ephesos Griechisch u. Deutsch. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1901. 2 m. 40 pf.

Durham (Charles L.) The subjunctive substantive clauses in Plautus, not including indirect questions. (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, No. XIII). New York, *The Macmillan Co.*, 1901. 80 cts.

Easby-Smith (James S.) The Songs of Alcaeus. Memoir and Text with literal and verse translations and notes. Washington, *W. H. Lowdermilk & Co.*, 1901.

Educational Extension in the United States. Chapter V of Report of Commissioner of Education, 1899-1900. Washington, *Government Printing Office*, 1901.

English Dictionary (Oxford). Ed. by I. A. H. Murray. L-LAP. Commencing Vol. VI, by Henry Bradley. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*. New York, *Henry Frowde*. 60 cts.

Fraser (H. W.) and Squair (J.) A French Grammar for Schools and Colleges. Boston, *D. C. Heath & Co.*, 1901. \$1.12.

Gerth (Bernhard). Griechische Schulgrammatik. 6. Auflage. Leipzig, G. Freytag, 1901. 2 m. 50 pf.

Guzman el Bueno por Gil y Zárate Zárate. Ed. by Sylvester Primer. Boston, Ginn & Co., 1901.

Hanssen (Federico). Notas á la prosodia castellana (Anales de la Universidad). Santiago de Chile, 1900.

Heidel (W. A.) On Plato's Euthyphro. *Transactions A. P. A.* Vol. XXXI. 1900.

Hermes. Herausg. v. Georg Kaibel u. Carl Robert. XXXVI. Band. 2. Heft. Berlin, Weidmann, 1901.

Kalbfleisch (Carolus). Papyri Argentoratenses Graecae ed. C. K. *Rostock Program*, 1901.

Laing (Mary E.) Reading, A Manual for Teachers (Heath's Pedagogical Library, 37). Boston, D. C. Heath, 1901.

Lawton (W. C.) The Rise of the Greek Drama. *Sewanee Review*, April, 1901.

Maryland Geological Survey. Eocene. Director: William Bullock Clark. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press.

Maximianus, The Elegies of. Ed. by Richard Webster. Princeton, The Princeton Press, 1900.

Meador (C. L.) The Latin Pronouns Is: Hic: Iste: Ipse. A semasiological study. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1901.

Modern Language Association of America, Publications of the. Ed. by James W. Bright. Vol. XVI, No. 2. N. S., Vol. IX, No. 2. Contents: Morgan Callaway, Jr. The Appositive Participle in Anglo-Saxon. Baltimore, The Association, 1901.

Muret-Sanders. Encyclopädisches Wörterbuch der englischen u. deutschen Sprache. Teil II. Deutsch-English. Lfg. 22: Tropfen-verdienen. Vollständig in 24 Lfggn. @ 1 m. 50. New York, The International News Co.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte u. deutsche Literatur u. für Pädagogik. Herausg. v. J. Olberg u. Richard Richter. Vierter Jahrg., 1901. VII. u. VIII. Bdes. 2-3. u. 4. Heft. Leipzig, Teubner, 1901.

Niebuhr (Carl). The Ancient East. No. II. The Tell el Amarna Period. London, David Nutt, 1901.

Owen (Ed. T.) A revision of the pronouns with special examination of relatives and relative clauses. Reprinted from the *Transactions of the Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts and Letters*. Vol. XIII.

Plato, The Meno of. Ed. with introduction, notes and excursuses by E. Seymer Thompson. London and New York, Macmillan, 1901.

Powell (J. W.) Sophiology or the Science of activities designed to give instruction. From the *American Anthropologist*. Vol. 3. January-March, 1901. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Rand (Edward Kennard). Der dem Boethius zugeschriebene Traktat *De fide catholica*. Besonderer Abdruck aus Jahrbücher f. klassische Philologie—XXVI. Supplementband. Leipzig, Teubner, 1901.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Herausg. von F. Bücheler u. H. Usener. N. F. LVI 2. Frankfurt a. M., J. D. Sauerländer, 1901.

Robert (Carl). Studien zur Ilias. Mit Beiträgen von Friedrich Bechtel. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1901. 16 m.

Sallust. The Conspiracy of Catiline. Allen and Greenough. Revised by J. B. Greenough and M. G. Daniell. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1901.

Smith (Clement L.) A Preliminary Study of Certain MSS of Suetonius' Lives of the Caesars. (Reprint from *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*. Vol. XII.)

Terenti (P.) Afri Andria with introduction and notes. By H. R. Fairclough. *Allyn & Bacon*, 1901. \$1.25.

West (Andrew Fleming). Roman Autobiography, particularly Augustine's Confessions. A lecture. *The De Vinne Press*, 1901.

Wilson (Harry Langford). The use of the Simple for the Compound verb in Juvenal. (*Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.*, vol. XXXI, 1900.)